

September 22, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

23857

contrast, the jewelry and landscaping-nursery departments had no gains.

Some of the money, however, will go for increased prices, at least in this west Florida area. "Six months ago I paid 10 cents in a local cafeteria for a dish of grated carrots. Now I pay 18 cents," complains Clarence Wahlers, a retired toolmaker of 79. "A year ago I could get a decent meal for \$1; tod it costs me \$1.25."

Eggs in the favorite restaurant of William Luth, a 73-year-old former construction laborer, now are 14 cents, up from 12 cents a week ago, he says. And Mr. and Mrs. Fred Weber complain that the "budget bacon" that cost them 35 cents a pound a few months ago now costs 70 cents.

The owner of a grocery store confirms that prices have been inching up the past few months because of higher costs to us. A restaurant owner says he has raised prices because of an expected minimum-wage law governing the restaurant business.

Not all the elderly, of course, are living such a hand-to-mouth existence. For the nonimpoverished, the new social security money will just mean a windfall, to be frittered away in one manner or another. "It's nice, sure," says William Wright, a 71-year-old with a scampish grin. "But I didn't need it. I have a nice pension from Bethlehem Steel and a few bucks tucked away." Mr. Wright feels he is so sound financially that he recently married, even though his 42-year-old bride isn't old enough for social security.

But for others, it will, as Mr. Souza says, make life a little easier. For Manly Corbin, 68, the money will mean "my first new suit in years." For John Morrow, 71, a \$40 retro-active check will help buy an old car.

For still others, however, the money won't be enough, especially to cover medical expenses. These people, though, look to medicare to help solve their problems and generally figure their ailments can wait to be treated next July, when the Government program of medical care for the elderly takes effect.

"I have a tumor on my back but I figure both it and I can last until next year when medicare goes into effect," says John Doran, a gravel-voiced man of 70 who used to buy food for a Buffalo, N.Y., restaurant chain. "I just can't spare the dough so Uncle Sam is going to pay for most of the operation."

Harvey Jackson, 79, concurs. "Several of my friends are putting off kidney and bladder operations until medicare goes into effect," he says. "Some don't have the money and others don't want to spend what they have."

ATLANTA CONSTITUTION NARRATES HOW EXPERIENCE POINTS TO NEED FOR NEW GI EDUCATION BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the unparalleled success of the GI bills of World War II and the Korean conflict provided the necessary financial impetus to enable some 10 million veterans to enroll for education and training at a cost to this Government which has been more than repaid. Indeed, information supplied by the Department of Labor and the Department of Commerce indicates that incomes of veterans who received GI bill assistance in education averaged from \$1,000 to \$1,500 a year more than the incomes of those who failed to take advantage of this educational aid. If we do not grant our approval to a new GI bill this session this Congress will be rejecting one of the

greatest opportunities to provide for the future intellectual and economic strength of America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article by the widely read Mr. George Boswell, which appeared in the September 17, 1965, issue of the influential and prestigious Atlanta, Ga. Constitution be printed at this point in the Record. The article is entitled "GI Bill Helped Build a Stronger Nation."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

GI BILL HELPED BUILD A STRONGER NATION

(By George Boswell)

The proposed cold war GI bill is a reminder of the remarkable results of the original GI bill of World War II. The bill was unprecedented. It was motivated largely by fears of what might happen to the country and its economy by the rapid dismantling of our military force, which at its peak numbered about 16 million men and women. This was accompanied, of course, by the reconversion of our gigantic industrial complex from a war basis to peace.

Whether or not it was justified, there was great worry about how these veterans—with average time in service of 2½ years—would readjust to civilian life. It was recalled that Mussolini and Hitler had risen to power with the support of disgruntled veterans. American veterans did not react that way, of course, but turned themselves into a mighty force to create a greater America. How much was due to the GI bill is impossible to measure but by any yardstick its cost was negligible compared to the benefits which have accrued to the Nation because of it.

No other country had ever attempted to aid veterans in readjustment on such a scale. Millions were put on the road to becoming self-reliant citizens and leaders of the Nation and their communities. Under its educational program, almost 8 million took advantage of opportunities to improve skills or to learn new ones.

More than 6.7 million home loans and 300,000 other loans with a face value of \$65 billion were made under guaranteed VA loans under the World War II and Korean GI bills. About 3 million of these already have been paid in full. Less than 3 percent have been terminated with claims.

To aid in the adjustments, the original GI bill allowed payments to veterans of \$20 per week for 52 weeks. This so-called "52-20" club was the most controversial feature of all, its critics claiming it would result in millions of loafers. They did not understand the returning GI. Among all veterans, an average of only 19 weeks of the allowance was used. Most were too busy finding better jobs, improving their future opportunities through education and training, creating new businesses and entering expanding trade fields.

Perhaps the greatest achievement was in the educational field. As a group, veterans who entered the Nation's schools and colleges proved themselves to be the best students in their respective institutions. They did not waste their opportunities and as a result the Nation was enriched by millions of college-trained leaders in business, science, skilled trades, and the professions with earnings that exceed those of nonveterans of the same age group.

The performance of these veterans confounded the critics who called the GI bill a senseless handout and socialism. They responded to the aid with individual zeal to become more independent and productive citizens in an economy that had to grow. The feared class of dependent veterans did not materialize.

THE IMMIGRATION BILL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, yesterday I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD five editorials which appeared in West Virginia newspapers in support of my opposition to the immigration bill. I have now received a sixth editorial, this one having appeared in the Weirton, W. Va., Daily Times on Tuesday, September 21.

I call attention to the following paragraphs taken from the editorial:

Certainly it is difficult to understand why we would want to encourage massive migration to the United States at the very time when our Nation is confronted with critical problems of unemployment, poverty, depressed areas, automation, integration, increasing crime, and a skyrocketing welfare bill.

The advocates of the change state that under the proposed legislation it will be easier for people "of special skills" to come into the country and help the U.S. economy. Yet, under the new legislation there would be an increase in quotas for such countries as Trinidad, Jamaica, Tanzania, Malawi, Yemen, and Nepal, and it would seem that persons with special skills needed in the United States might be very hard to find in those countries. Besides, these countries need the services of their talented and trained people more than we do if they hope to build a better economy.

The United States need make no apologies for its immigration policies which already are far more liberal than other countries and in view of the fact that other advanced nations are selective in dealing with immigrants * * *

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point the entire editorial from the Weirton Daily Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HOLD THE LINE

U.S. Senator ROBERT C. BYRD has taken a very reasonable and sound stand in opposing the administration's proposed new immigration bill which would scrap the basic national origins quota system first drawn in 1924.

Admittedly there are some weaknesses in the present system as it applies no limitations on immigration from South America and other Western Hemispheric countries, yet it has served the interests of the United States well in the past. The proposed legislation now being considered, however, would pose grave problems for our country and in a way could lessen the effectiveness of current U.S. policy to help other countries improve their economic conditions.

Certainly it is difficult to understand why we would want to encourage massive migration to the United States at the very time when our Nation is confronted with critical problems of unemployment, poverty, depressed areas, automation, integration, increasing crime and a skyrocketing welfare bill.

In many parts of the country, including our own, joblessness remains a nagging problem. As stated by Senator Byrd, sooner or later we are going to have to recognize the realities of this situation and admit to ourselves that our first responsibility in matters of immigration is to the people of the United States and not to the entire population of the world.

The advocates of the change state that under the proposed legislation it will be easier for people of special skills to come

into the country and help the U.S. economy. Yet, under the new legislation, there would be an increase in quotas for such countries as Trinidad, Jamaica, Tanzania, Malawi, Yemen, and Nepal, and it would seem that persons with special skills needed in the United States might be very hard to find in those countries. Besides, these countries need the services of their talented and trained people more than we do if they hope to build a better economy.

Under the present system, it is true that relatively larger quotas are assigned to such countries as England, Scotland, Ireland, Germany, France, and Scandinavia, but this is because the basic population of our country is made up largely of stocks which originated from those countries, and the reasoning back of the present system is that additional population from those countries would be more easily and readily assimilated into the American population. As pointed out by the West Virginia Senator, there are fine human beings in all parts of the world, but peoples do differ widely in their social habits, their levels of ambition, their mechanical aptitudes, their inherited ability and intelligence, their moral traditions, and their capacities for maintaining stable governments.

The United States need make no apologies for its immigration policies which already are far more liberal than other countries and in view of the fact that other advanced nations are selective in dealing with immigrants.

The time is here when we must begin thinking about our own national interest without being influenced by foreign nationals. We fully support the stand of Senator BYRD on this vital issue.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 29, line 4, change the period to a semicolon and add the following: "Provided, That for all fiscal years after the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, said 170,000 shall be reduced by the number of special immigrants, exclusive of special immigrants defined in section 101(a)(27)(A), and immediate relatives admitted to the United States for permanent residence during the fiscal year."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, my amendment would not affect the application of the bill to the increased immigration prior to June 30, 1968. It is my understanding that there is a backlog of immigrant applications which should be taken care of. I understand from the

distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator in charge of the bill, that it is anticipated that after 3 years the backlogs of impending immigrants will be eliminated in all instances except for one category of Italians, and that the situation will be rectified shortly thereafter. So during the next 3 years, the backlog of immigrants can be substantially cleaned up.

I believe we ought to focus our attention on what will happen after that. What will happen on July 1, 1968? My amendment is concerned with what will happen after that date.

I am aware of how complicated the whole subject of immigration is. Much confusion exists with respect to it. There are quota immigrants, there are nonquota immigrants, and there are specially exempt categories. If one tries to concern himself with these groups, he may end by seeing only the trees, and not seeing the forest. I believe we ought to be concerned with the forest; namely, the total number of immigrants, regardless of their quality, whether they are called quota, nonquota, or exempt categories. The question should be, How many immigrants are coming into the United States, and how many will be coming into the United States?

The national origins policy which has existed for many years leaves much to be desired. Probably the principal thrust of the bill is to do away with the national origins policy and to treat all people alike, regardless of the country from which they come, so long as they can satisfy the category requirements provided in the bill. My amendment has nothing to do with that. It has only to do with the total number of immigrants that will be coming into the United States starting on July 1, 1968.

The record shows that in 1960, the total number of immigrants into the United States was 265,000; in 1961, 271,000; in 1962, 283,000; in 1963, 306,000; and in 1964, 292,000. To all intents and purposes, it appears that the bill provides for 290,000 immigrants, 170,000 from the world at large and 120,000 from the Western Hemisphere.

But the bill goes further: It provides for certain exempt categories in addition to the 290,000. According to the record it is estimated that over and above the 290,000, we can expect 50,000, or 70,000 more immigrants a year. No one knows with certainty what the number in the exempt categories will amount to. But as I recall, the Attorney General estimated that 62,500 more immigrants a year would come in starting on July 1, 1968, than are coming in now.

With respect to the confusion to which I referred earlier, considerable point has been made concerning the present annual quotas which some countries have and how low they are. For example, Greece has been mentioned as having an annual quota for 1964 of only 849. However, the record should show, so that the people will know exactly what is taking place, that while 849 quota immigrants were authorized for Greece in 1964, there were 3,060 nonquota immi-

grants admitted from Greece. This immigration was entirely legal but was in addition to the regular quota.

There are other examples. Last year, Italy was authorized 5,950 immigrants; yet 7,295 nonquota immigrants were admitted over and above the quota immigrants. So perhaps the way the present program has been working, so far as certain countries are concerned, there may not be so much hardship as the plain quota figures would indicate. The total number of persons who have been legally admitted is what really counts.

To return to my amendment, it seems to me that if the policy of Congress is to do away with the national origins system and at the same time preserve the total number of immigrants at about the same rate at which they have been admitted during the last few years, the target ought to be somewhere around 290,000 to 300,000. Assuming that the target is 290,000, I have left the figures of 170,000 and 120,000 undisturbed; but my amendment provides that the 170,000 quota immigrants for the world at large shall be reduced by the number of special immigrants who are exempted under the bill; and that after the 170,000 is reduced by the number of special immigrants who are admitted into the United States, the remainder would be quota immigrants.

My amendment is not intended to reduce the 120,000 total number of immigrants. The intention is to retain the 170,000 figure and to start by taking the exempt categories off the top. Then, after they have been admitted, we shall know how many quota immigrants can be taken in.

If the exempt categories amounted to 10,000 immigrants in 1 year, we would have 160,000 quota immigrants. If the exempt categories amounted to 20,000, we would have 150,000 quota immigrants.

There is no intention of reducing the number of immigrants in any one year below 290,000—170,000 from the world at large and 120,000 from Latin America.

On the other hand, if it is the intention of the administration and the policy of Congress not only to do away with the national origins system, but also to increase the total number of immigrants coming into the United States by 50,000, 60,000, or 70,000 a year, starting on July 1, 1968, then my amendment should be rejected and the bill should be passed in its present form.

Mr. President, I see no reason for any further explanation of my amendment. It is very simple. I believe that the issue is clear.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I should like to review with the Senator from Iowa the intention of his amendment. I believe I understand from the remarks of the Senator from Iowa what he is attempting to do in general, but I am not sure that the language of his amendment is

fully clear on its face. The amendment reads in part:

Provided, That for all fiscal years after the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, said 170,000 shall be reduced by the number of special immigrants—

Special immigrants have been defined under the bill to apply to those coming from the Western Hemisphere, which number has been set at 120,000; I read further from the amendment—

exclusive of special immigrants defined in section 101(a)(27)(A), and immediate relatives admitted to the United States for permanent residence during the fiscal year—

It seems to me, if I read the amendment correctly, that it would provide that, for all fiscal years after the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the figure of 170,000 shall be reduced by the number of special immigrants—which, as defined by this bill, would mean those from the Western Hemisphere, as well as immediate relatives admitted to the United States for permanent residence during the fiscal year.

So as I read the amendment, what the Senator is attempting to do is to reduce the figure of 170,000 by the number of special immigrants. It would also include those defined in the McCarran-Walter Act as having a particular immediate family relationship, who would be admitted to the United States for permanent residence during the fiscal year.

I wish to ascertain whether I read that language correctly before I address my comments to the relative merits of the amendment of the Senator from Iowa. I do so because I have not seen this amendment before and received it but a few brief minutes ago.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts. I believe that we ought to be in agreement on the language before we enter into a discussion of the merits.

I would be the last one in the world to suggest, in dealing with a complex subject such as this, that this amendment is letter perfect. I believe that it is accurate. The language which states that the 170,000 shall be reduced by the number of special immigrants does not relate to Western Hemisphere people at all. The term "special immigrants" refers to the special category born in the Western Hemisphere, children, spouses, and parents of immigrants previously admitted to the United States for permanent residence, but who have temporarily been abroad, former U.S. citizens who are now eligible to reapply for citizenship, ministers, and their spouses and children, employees, and retired former employees of the U.S. Government.

Some people who have been born in the Western Hemisphere are residents of the United States and of other countries in the world at large outside the Western Hemisphere. However, this is the group which is referred to and covered by the phrase "special immigrants."

I have in my amendment specifically excluded special immigrants defined in section 101(a)(27)(A). These are the people from the Western Hemisphere,

concerning which the 120,000 limitation is placed in the bill.

I suggest to the Senator that my amendment would provide that the 170,000 shall be reduced only by the special categories to which I have referred, and that it would not include the 120,000 Western Hemisphere people referred to or covered by section 101(a)(27)(A).

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I refer to the committee report and the description contained in the report concerning section 8 of the bill. It reads as follows:

Section 8 of the bill amends section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Section 101(a)(27) of that act, which defines "nonquota immigrant," is amended to eliminate the term "nonquota immigrant," and insert in lieu thereof "special immigrant." Therefore, natives of independent countries of the Western Hemisphere, returning resident aliens, certain former citizens of the United States, ministers of religion, and certain retired employees of the U.S. Government abroad previously referred to as "nonquota immigrants," will henceforth be referred to as "special immigrants."

Before we get into the question of the merits of this amendment, I wish to be absolutely sure of what we are talking about. Are we sure that under this amendment we would not take the figure of 170,000 and reduce it by the number of special immigrants, which for the general purpose of discussion includes Western Hemisphere and certain others under section 101. Are we sure that we would not be taking the 170,000 and reducing it by 120,000, because that number of Western Hemisphere immigrants would fall within the definition of special immigrants as defined by the legislation?

If that is not correct, I believe that the amendment would be a bit unrealistic at this point. If I correctly understand what the Senator is trying to do—and perhaps we could have a discussion of it—it is the intent of the Senator to provide that those who have a special family relationship may be included within the 170,000—sons and daughters, brothers and sisters, and parents of American citizens.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I believe that is the fundamental point of the Senator from Iowa. I should like to comment briefly on that point.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I must insist that the language contained in the amendment which says "exclusive of special immigrants defined in section 101(a)(27)(A)" refers to the 120,000 Western Hemisphere people.

If the Senator will look at section 101(a)(27)(A), I am sure that he will find that this is the section that covers the Western Hemisphere people on which the 120,000 limitation is placed in the bill. I fully intend to say, and I believe the amendment does say, that we will not take those people into account at all. They would be excluded from the coverage of my amendment.

We are not meddling with the Western Hemisphere 120,000 figure at all. All I

want to do is to subtract or deduct from the 170,000 those special categories to which the Senator has just referred.

I invite the attention of the Senator to page 28 of the committee report. Down near the bottom of the page, there appears section 101(a)(27) which defines special immigrants. However, section 101(a)(27)(A) would be specifically excluded under my amendment. So the other categories are included. Those would be the family-type relationships to which the Senator has been referring.

If there is any difficulty over the legislative drafting of this amendment, I am sure that we can get together on it. However, I should like to have a little discussion with the Senator about the objectives of my amendment. I assume that we can get together on the legislative drafting.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] has raised a point which is basic and fundamental to the legislation the Senate is considering this afternoon whether we will have a figure of 170,000 numbers for the world, and whether it will be 120,000 numbers for the Western Hemisphere, all exclusive of immediate relatives as deferred in the bill. These are figures arrived at in a way that should be reviewed, and I shall review it very briefly.

At the time of legislative consideration prior to the passage of the 1924 Immigration Act, the figure of 150,000 was established. It was based on an annual total number of immigrants equal to one-sixth of 1 percent of the population of the United States in 1920. Quotas were then assigned on the basis of the nationality of the U.S. white population at that time.

The figure of 150,000 was gradually raised as new independent countries were recognized by the United States, until it reached 158,561, which is the figure today. The figure of 170,000 represents these 158,561 numbers plus the inclusion of 10,200 numbers set aside for refugees, which would make a total of 168,761. That figure was rounded off at 170,000. For the Western Hemisphere countries, the figure of 120,000, exclusive of immediate relatives, was reached on the basis of experience during the past 5 to 10 years.

Thus, Mr. President, we arrive at the figures that we are talking about, 170,000 for countries throughout the world exclusive of the Western Hemisphere, and 120,000 for countries in the Western Hemisphere.

The Senator from Iowa raises the question, Should not there immediate family relationships be included in the 170,000?

Mr. President, that would attack the very basis of the pending legislation, aside from the elimination of the national origins system and the Asian-Pacific triangle.

The McCarran-Walter Act, under its preference system, assigns 50 percent of all quota members to skilled aliens who have particular skills which are urgently needed in the economy of the United States.

That entire preference concept has been changed in the pending legislation

to one emphasizing the reunification of families. The preferences in this bill have thus been changed to provide that preferential consideration shall be given to family reunification. The first preference is for those who would come to the United States as unmarried sons and daughters of American citizens, the second preference is for family relatives of aliens, the third, and only the third preference—and this is only 10 percent—to those who have skills at the professional level. The fourth preference is given to married sons and daughters of U.S. citizens. The fifth preference is given to brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens; the sixth preference is given to labor needed here because of a short supply in certain types of labor, the seventh to the refugees; and the eighth is left for what are called new seed immigrants.

In this legislation, therefore, those who have particular skills are reduced to third and sixth preferences. The bill recognizes the basic human concern which Americans have for the reunification of families. We know, even looking at today's situation under the McCarran-Walter Act, referring to figures from the Department of State, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, that there are numbers of instances of family separation caused by our immigration laws. For instance, in the Asia Pacific triangle, under the second preference of the McCarran-Walter Act, covering parents of U.S. citizens 21 years of age or over and unmarried sons and daughters of U.S. citizens, there are 52 parents of American citizens who would like to come to the United States; there are 1,300 people of Chinese extraction; there are 876 Greek family separation cases; 29 from India, 39 from Iran, 25 from Iraq, 231 from Panama, 151 from Japan, 49 from Korea, 615 from the Philippines, 166 from Portugal, 318 from Turkey, and so on.

These are typical examples. It was because of these examples that such serious consideration was given by the subcommittees in both the House of Representatives and the Senate to the importance of the reunification of families.

I recognize, as the Senator from Iowa has stated, that with the exception of some special family relationships—such as those of certain categories of Italians, we would in the next 3 years reunify the families now awaiting reunification. Nonetheless, under this amendment, the problem would arise repeatedly in the future. It is well to consider the basic concept and philosophy of this legislation. It would be regressive to change the special consideration for which the bill provides, and I would hope that the Senator from Iowa would reconsider his proposal.

Mr. MILLER. Let me say to my friend the Senator from Massachusetts that I agree with him in all he has said about reunification of families. However, I invite his attention to the fact that the figures he has quoted are figures which have arisen under the backlog created under the present law, which should be taken care of in the next 3

years. I cannot believe that 3 years from now he will be able to show any such figures as he has given us, because the intention of the bill is that these cases be taken care of in the next 3 years. My amendment has nothing whatsoever to do with that period of time so far as the bill is concerned.

I suggest further that another reason why the figures the Senator from Massachusetts has given us exist is the unfortunate national origins policy under which this country has been operating. The pending bill would abolish that; and there again, I cannot imagine that 3 years from now there will be any figures of such magnitude available, because the national origins system will be out, and we shall have much more flexibility in handling family reunification problems.

Are we going to make a decision on the total number of people per year that will be coming into the United States starting July 1, 1968? If we are going to make a decision on that total, what is the total to be?

My amendment would leave the total at 290,000, which is almost exactly what the figure was last year, 170,000 for the world at large and the 120,000 for the Western Hemisphere.

The way the bill is now written, it would not be 290,000, but, rather, 290,000, plus whatever number would come in under the exempt categories. We are told that this figure could be 40,000, 50,000, 60,000 or 70,000 a year. The Attorney General has testified that his estimate was 62,500 a year. However, no one knows.

We do know, however, that it would be more than we are taking in now.

I believe it would be better, if the Senator from Massachusetts believes that 290,000 is too low, to make the figure 180,000, instead of 170,000; and we could make the Western Hemisphere figure 120,000 or 130,000. Then we would have 310,000 immigrants a year, and we would know what the ceiling would be. We could then adapt my amendment to that situation, by providing that the various exempt categories should come off the top, and the other categories should be divided. We are not talking about a hardship situation. The bill is designed to deal with the hardship situation.

What is involved is a policy decision that should be faced. The American people should know exactly what is being done. I know of no one who is not in favor of doing away with the national origin system. I believe all Senators are in agreement on that point.

The question is what we should do about numbers. Let us not get down to quotas, and so forth. Let us know where we are going.

Under the bill we shall have perhaps 365,000 a year. It is roughly 290,000 a year now. Perhaps that is what we should do. I am not necessarily saying that we should not do it, but I believe it would be a good idea to get at the figures that we have now and clean up the figures in the next 3 years, and say that they ought to be cleaned up. Then we could start on July 1, 1968, knowing exactly where we are going.

At that time, if it is decided to be in

the national interest to increase our immigrant total over 300,000 and make it 365,000, that is the time for Congress to make that decision. I believe that it is a little premature at this time, particularly in the case of such an important piece of legislation, to make that anticipation. It seems to me that what we should do is to stay with the figure of approximately 290,000, so that everyone will know that the 290,000 immigrants will be admitted into the United States, starting July 1, 1968; and that is exactly what my amendment would do.

I ask the Senator from Massachusetts if he is satisfied with the language of my amendment. I would feel unhappy about having the amendment go off on the basis of a dispute over the drafting of the amendment. I believe that it really should go off on the basis of a decision as to whether we are to have a ceiling on the total number we are admitting now.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The amendment offered by the Senator may still be open to interpretation, but that thought aside, we could certainly work out language to include what the Senator from Iowa is attempting to do. It is open to different interpretations, but it would be fair to say that it could include what the Senator from Iowa has mentioned.

I go back to the fact that through the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, we have been able to determine that we can expect over time, given the present legislation which is now being considered by the Senate, between 50,000 and 60,000 people who will come in and take advantage of our new immigration laws. This is based upon similar conditions in the past, the knowledge of present demands, and anticipation for future demands.

I do not believe that there is any Senator who does not recognize that this bill establishes a worldwide quota, exclusive of the Western Hemisphere.

There is also a number that will be given to the Western Hemisphere, and that has to be exclusive of those which have close family relationships. Families are excluded by the announced policy of those who have supported the proposed legislation that they should be given special consideration.

We recognize that there will be between 50,000 and 60,000 people—the best figures we have been able to acquire—who will come in. Thus, I would feel that if the Senator from Iowa has an amendment to restrict the total number—as I would gather from the colloquy this afternoon by establishing a worldwide quota—I believe that this would be something for Senators to study. I feel, however, that this question has been debated, both by the proponents and the opponents of the bill. It has also been specifically determined, and defended in committee that those who have a particular family relationship will not be considered the same as other immigrants.

This is the whole concept of the bill.

The reunification of families is provided for by the new preference system and the immediate relative category.

Thus, I submit, as worthy as the amendment may appear to the Senator, and notwithstanding the great respect I have for the Senator from Iowa, I believe that his amendment would attack the fundamental concept of the bill—that is, to guarantee the unification of families. If the Senate is interested in putting a fixed worldwide quota in our laws, that is one thing, but I believe this amendment would do a great disservice to the concept embodied in the proposed legislation. I believe that that concept is good and should continue. I would certainly be opposed to any alteration of that very basic and fundamental principle in the proposed legislation.

Mr. MILLER. I am not particularly interested in disrupting family relationships. That is not the intention behind my amendment. I take it that is the basic difficulty the Senator from Massachusetts finds with the amendment.

As I understand, the bill would establish a list of seven preference priorities: Unmarried sons or daughters of U.S. citizens; husbands and wives, unmarried sons or daughters of alien residents; members of professions; married sons or daughters of U.S. citizens; brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens; skilled and unskilled persons capable of filling labor shortages; and refugees from communism.

I should like to ask this question of the Senator from Massachusetts: Assuming that we have the 170,000 world-at-large figure, and there are 170,000 people in the categories which are set forth as preferences in the bill; would he anticipate that those who did not meet the preference categories would come in under nonpreference?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. That is the final preference category.

Mr. MILLER. All right.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. There are provisions for visa numbers to spill down from preference category to preference category. Those that run out of the first preference go to the second. Those that run off the second go to the fourth. They do not go to the third, which deals with the professionals. In the final analysis, all unused numbers go to what is called the new seed preference.

Mr. MILLER. If what the Senator is concerned about is the family group and some of the professions, for example, I wonder whether we could not get into the bill the purpose of my amendment, by providing that the reduction shall come only from the nonpreference categories, so that if we had 170,000 for the world at large, and we would subtract from that the number that would come in under the exempt category 20,000, if 150,000 were embraced in the seven preference priorities, in that way we would have a total of 170,000 which would include the exempt categories and the preference categories—the family relationship people, and the skilled and unskilled people, but there would not be any preference people admitted in that situation.

Would the Senator have any objection to an amendment which would provide that the categories in the preference sec-

tion, which he is obviously concerned about—and which I am also concerned about—are protected, so that the only result of my amendment is a given situation would result in a reduction of the nonpreference categories.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Is the Senator now referring to the last preference category?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The Senator would reduce the new need category. May I ask to what extent?

Mr. MILLER. To the extent that the exempt categories total—

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. How does the Senator know the situation in any given country?

The Senator realizes, does he not, that there is a restriction on each country?

Mr. MILLER. I know that there is a restriction. It is a fairly liberal restriction.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Does the Senator believe that it could possibly apply to Italy, with the great emphasis on family relationships, with the given restrictions which are even in this bill. It is unrealistic.

Mr. MILLER. It would not apply at all, because in my suggestion, all the family relationships I am talking about would be left unimpeded under the 170,000 figure. I would provide that with respect to categories, that particular total would be reduced, if necessary, by the total number of the exempt categories who are admitted over and above the 170,000.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, we have been having hearings since February of this year, in which each of these preference categories was considered in great detail. We worked them out on the basis of experience, needs, and demands. The Senate committee considered them. The House committee considered them. I think what we eventually come down to in this dialog with the Senator from Iowa is whether we ought to be establishing a worldwide quota.

This question is basic to the subject. We have had months of hearings on this particular subject. Members of the committee considered it in detail. The amendment of the Senator from Iowa takes us back to a fundamental decision, and that is the particular relationship of the available numbers to the world and the Western Hemisphere, as well as the considerations that we will give to the close family relationships.

Now the Senator from Iowa comes in at the final hour with a proposal to alter the basic structure of the bill. I do not believe the amendment should be favorably considered. I oppose the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I have a question to ask the Senator in charge of the bill. Is it correct that in considering this legislation the committee did look into the figure of 170,000 and the figure of 120,000 with respect to Latin America, and the question of special immigrants?

Is it not correct that those matters were considered in great detail?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The Senator is correct. Not only that, but in considering the allocation under section 203, we considered the question whether those to be admitted were to be unmarried sons or daughters of American citizens, or unmarried sons or daughters of alien residents. We considered how it would affect immigrants with special skills, and how and whether they should benefit from spillovers from subsections (1) and (2). We considered the question of what percent should be given to refugees and so forth.

The whole question has been given a great deal of concern and consideration by the voluntary agencies which have been concerned with these matters. Members of Congress who are concerned as a result of the constant examples being brought to the attention of their offices in this field have considered it. After reviewing all those factors, we worked this matter out. In the final hour, to alter the bill or to give different priorities would not be the course of wisdom.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Therefore, as the committee considered the bill, instead of arriving at the figure of 170,000, it could have arrived at the figure of 120,000. However, it was decided by the committee to arrive at the figure of 170,000, but that the other would be left flexible. Was that factor considered?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. It was considered. There was considerable discussion as to whether there should be a worldwide quota. We did not think it would be worthwhile.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Is it anticipated that any immigrant who comes in under that category will be a charge to the United States?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. No. As the Senator from New York knows, because he testified on this matter, that the labor provisions have been strengthened. The public health charge provisions are still in existence. The other broad provisions which deal with security, health, and all the rest, have been carried through from the old McCarran Act. They are worthwhile, and were retained, and in some instances strengthened.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Was there a feeling in the committee that the United States, with a working population of some 70 million, could not afford to bring in this group of immigrants who have special skills or special relationships here in the United States? Was that question gone into by the committee?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. It was. As the Senator from New York knows, the total number who will be admitted into this country under the bill will be a lesser percentage in relation to our population in 1965 than the number of people who came into this country in 1924, when this very restrictive legislation was adopted. So, for many reasons, some of which I have gone into, the committee reached a certain figure. I believe it would be unfortunate to tamper with it at this late hour.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. What the amendment of the Senator from Iowa

September 22, 1965

actually amounts to, in substance, is the reduction of the number of persons who may come into this country by 40,000 or 50,000 or 60,000. Is that correct?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. That is what it amounts to.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. This question was considered. It was gone into in great detail, based on what we have done in the past, and what we can do in the future. There are restrictions imposed as to the people who will come into this country, so that they will not become public charges but can contribute to and aid our economy, or who have close relatives in this country. The entire question was gone into by the committee. I do not think it appropriate now to say that we should cut that quota by 25,000 or 30,000.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The Senator has touched on the fundamental point of the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa—the idea that between 40,000 and 50,000 shall be cut out of the total number of people who could come into this country. That is what the amendment of the Senator from Iowa attempts to accomplish. As the Senator from New York mentioned, the figures which are set forth in the bill have been carefully considered. I believe they are basically meritorious and that they should be supported.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Three points should be made. First, with respect to the question of the Senator from New York, as to whether this amendment would cut anything, it ought to be made very clear that it is not going to cut anything from what we are doing. My amendment would leave in all 290,000. We admitted 292,000 last year. We admitted fewer before that. I have given the 5-year average. The average for the past 5 years is well under 290,000. I do not see how anyone can say that my amendment would cut anything. If the Senator tells me that we are going to admit 65,000 people a year more than we are admitting now, my amendment is calculated to prevent that, but it is not going to cut anything over and above what we are doing now.

That is the first point.

The second point—

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point, before he goes to another point?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. That point has been understood. It was brought out by me, when I introduced the bill. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] has strong feelings on the matter. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] has opposed it in the past 4 or 5 days of debate during which the bill has been before the Senate—namely, that we are going to have an increase of 40,000 or 50,000 immigrants under this bill. That is recognized, and if there is any Member of the Senate who is under the impression that that has not been brought out, I would like to clear the air on that point

right now. If the Senator from Iowa says he wants to include immediate relatives under the other categories, his amendment would in effect cut down the total number of people who will be affected by H.R. 2580.

Mr. MILLER. And will come in under the bill starting in 1968.

I wish to make it clear that my amendment is not designed to cut down any numbers we have been admitting up through 1964, or that the amendment would reduce the figure to 290,000.

I have no objection to making it 300,000. I do not want to become bogged down with a feeling that we are cutting 200,000 or 300,000—300,000 is all right with me.

The point is that we are going to increase the total number under this bill, starting in July 1968, by 40,000, 50,000, 60,000, or 70,000. I believe that is a point that ought to be clearly brought out.

I regret that I was not acquainted with the total increase that would come in under the bill until day before yesterday. It may be that these figures were all brought out in the hearings. Senators sitting in those hearings would be familiar with it, but I do not believe it is easily found in the committee report. It can be found, but it takes quite a bit of digging to do it.

The press releases and newspaper articles on this subject have all dealt with the national origins system, and there has been discussion about putting a limitation on the Western Hemisphere. All I have seen in the press is the increase over and above what we are talking about now.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I would feel that I had performed a disservice to Senators unless I made clear the implication of the bill.

We introduced the bill. It came before the Senate last Friday. I made a speech to enlighten the American people on the subject. During that speech I said that there would be some increase in total immigration to the United States of 50,000 to 60,000 a year. This would result by changing the law to a worldwide system from a nation-by-nation system. These are the numbers that go unused each year. Many quotas are going to countries where they are not utilized.

We shall use about 60,000 more for immediate relatives. It is the 60,000 for immediate relatives that is the subject of the Senator from Iowa. These are family people—brothers and sisters; husbands and wives; fathers and sons.

This subject was gone into by the committee. If the Senator from Iowa failed to appreciate that fact and did not recognize that fact I am sorry but, it is a matter which has been clearly outlined in the Record.

I believe we have examined this subject. I have no further comments to make.

If the Senator is interested in a vote, I am prepared to vote.

Mr. MILLER. Before we vote, I would like to continue with what I was saying.

Before I do, I say to the Senator from

Massachusetts that my comments were not directed at him in any form of criticism regarding the increase under the pending bill.

But I point out to him that there are many Senators not yet familiar with this matter. He made the point that I came in at the last minute with an amendment.

I want him to understand why. While I do not care if an amendment comes in at the last minute, a day before, or a year before, the important thing is the amendment. If it is a good amendment, it ought to be adopted. I do not believe that the fact that it is brought in at the last minute necessarily means it is not a good amendment.

I am sorry that because of the nature of things, I did not know about this increase. My lack of appreciation of this fact is shared by many Senators. This is not said in criticism of the Senator from Massachusetts. It is in the nature of things that arise in complicated pieces of legislation.

As I understand, in the contemplation of the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], it is not envisioned that any people coming in under this bill are to become public charges. They will have their skills; otherwise they will not be admitted. I recognize that there is no intention to bring in people who will be public charges.

This question is not at issue in this amendment. All of this has been gone into in the course of this legislation and the Senator from Iowa is satisfied on this point. It has nothing to do with my amendment.

But I would suggest that when it comes to considering whether or not we can absorb some of these people into our employment picture, there is involved only 10 percent of the 17,000 or 170,000 people we are talking about.

I would not find too much difficulty if only 17,000 people were involved. We are talking about 290,000 plus another 65,000 people.

Finally, I wish to make it clear with respect to relatives, children, and spouses of our citizens, that my amendment has nothing to do with them, because they come off the top; they are the first to come in under the 170,000. They are not the last ones, and they are not left off. Then, after that, there are those other preference priorities who come in.

As a result of our conversation, so that objections of the Senator from Massachusetts may be fully met, and so that it may be made clear that other family relationships are not interfered with by my amendment, I modify my amendment by striking the period at the end of the amendment and inserting a semicolon and adding the following: "and provided further that such reduction shall only affect the numbers admitted under section 203(a)(8)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). The Senator so modifies his amendment.

Mr. MILLER. This makes clear that if there are any reductions, they will come only from the nonpreference category and have nothing to do with family relationships whatever—with the sons

and daughters, husbands and wives, or any of the others about whom the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Iowa are concerned. Nor would it affect members of the professions and skills and refugees from Communists.

Mr. President, I believe that the amendment is a fair amendment. I would hope that the Senator from Massachusetts would see fit to take the amendment to conference and see what can be done about it, because I do believe it relieves the problems with which he and I are both concerned.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I have commented earlier on the thrust of the amendment of the Senator from Iowa. I am opposed to it.

The percentages we are discussing were the subject of hearings and discussions. They have been allocated as mentioned in the bill, as follows: The first category, 20 percent, or 34,000 members to unmarried sons or daughters of U.S. citizens; second category, 20 percent, or 34,000 for spouses, unmarried sons or daughters of aliens; third category, 10 percent, or 17,000 for professionals; fourth category, 10 percent, or 17,000 for married sons or daughters of U.S. citizens; fifth category, 24 percent, or 40,800 for brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens; sixth category, 10 percent, or 17,000 for skilled or unskilled labor in short supply; seventh category, 6 percent or 10,200 for refugees; the remainder is for nonpreference or "new seed" immigrants.

These are the percentages which have been arrived at by the subcommittee and the committee after extensive and exhaustive hearings.

I do not depreciate the importance of bringing an amendment to the floor in the final hour, if it is a worthwhile amendment. However, one so basic to the whole structure of the bill and the allocations of visa numbers does a disservice to the concern and consideration that the subcommittee and the full committee gave to these allocations.

Therefore I urge that the amendment not be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 458

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I send to the desk a revised version of my amendment No. 458 and ask that it be considered in place of the original amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

At an appropriate place in the bill, insert the following:

"SEC. —. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person involuntarily brought physically into the United States by the United States Government or its agents shall subsequently be deported from the United States, except prisoners of war as defined by the Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War dated at Geneva, August 12, 1949."

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, under this amendment, I propose to add to the law the following provision:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person involuntarily brought physically into the United States by the U.S. Government or its agents shall subsequently be deported from the United States, except prisoners of war as defined by the Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War dated at Geneva, August 12, 1949.

The modification has added at the end of the original amendment a provision which excepts prisoners of war who may be brought into the United States such as occurred during the Second World War. Other than this modification, the amendment remains as it was originally introduced.

This amendment means precisely what it says. No person, except a prisoner of war, who is brought involuntarily into the United States by the U.S. Government could be subsequently deported. The amendment would not be limited to cases of extradition, but would be specifically directed at cases in which, not extradition, but direct force is the method used to bring persons into the United States.

There is now nothing on the law books which deals in any way with situations of this type. Insofar as I know, there has been no occasion in past years in which the U.S. Government has engaged in activity which would be covered by this amendment. Unfortunately, it appears from newspaper reports that such an incident did occur on approximately September 8 of this year.

The incident, if accurately reported, is one of the most shameful exhibitions ever charged against the U.S. Government.

According to press reports, the following sequence of events occurred in the Dominican Republic. A proposal advanced by the Organization of the American States, which the press has characterized as bearing the stamp, "Made in U.S.A.," was signed by the rebel forces in the Dominican Republic. Those opposing the rebels refused to sign it. This agreement, in addition to establishing an interim government under Mr. Garcia-Godoy, provided that the rebels turn in their weapons to the provisional government. After the agreement was signed, the rebels refused to carry out the agreement so long as General Wessin y Wessin remained in the Dominican Republic. General Wessin was commander of the Armed Forces Training Center of the Dominican Republic. On September 8, the press reports revealed that an attempt had been made by U.S. personnel, identified as David Phillips, of the Central Intelligence Agency, and Lt. Col. Joseph William Wersick, U.S. Army, to bribe Gen. Wessin y Wessin to leave the Dominican Republic. According to the press reports, General Wessin rejected the attempt and denounced it. On the following day, the press reported that General Wessin was arrested by American personnel and, while under arrest, was taken to an American military aircraft, by which he was transported first to Panama and subsequently to Miami, Fla. At the same time, the press reported that General Wessin would be Dominican Consul in Miami. Subsequently, in Miami, General Wessin refused to accept the appointment as Dominican Consul and charged that he had been arrested by U.S. Army personnel and deported to the United States by U.S. officials.

Mr. President, there has appeared no convincing denial by the U.S. Government of these press accounts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a series of news articles, which I have briefly summarized, be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there are many factors surrounding the recent events in the Dominican Republic, and the action taken against General Wessin y Wessin, which raise fundamental questions concerning the current policy of the United States of America on the Dominican Republic. One cannot avoid the conclusion that the United States is joining in a policy of appeasement of the rebel forces in the Dominican Republic, and is taking steps which strengthen the hands of the Communists in that island Republic. Quite obviously, the policy of appeasement and accommodation of the Communist forces is continuing to work to our disadvantage. Despite General Wessin's removal, the press still reports that the Dominican rebels continue in their refusal to surrender their weapons.

Regardless of the wisdom or lack of wisdom which characterizes our current policies in the Dominican Republic, or the degree of the incident's effect on such policy, the heavy-handed treatment of General Wessin constitutes a shameful blot on the record of our Nation in foreign affairs. The circumstances reported, if the act had been committed by private parties, would support a criminal charge of kidnapping. There was not even a pretense of legality under the law of any nation or the law of nations.

The status of General Wessin in the United States is a tenuous one. From the press reports, it would appear that General Wessin was brought into this country prior to the issuance to him, or for him, of any passport or visa. It would appear that a diplomatic visa, if one had been subsequently issued, would have been in order had General Wessin accepted the post of Consul in Miami. This was invalidated, if it ever existed, by

his refusal to accept the post. Under the circumstances, it would appear that he is subject to a deportation action by the U.S. Government, should the U.S. Government decide to initiate a deportation procedure. The amendment which I offer would prevent any deportation of General Wessin, or any person in similar circumstances, upon a showing by them that they had been brought involuntarily into the United States by the U.S. Government or its agents.

This amendment would in no way, of course, prevent General Wessin, or other persons similarly situated, from departing voluntarily from the United States. If they should so voluntarily depart, the amendment would not in the future apply if they subsequently also voluntarily returned to the United States.

This amendment would, of course, be little in the way of mitigation of the offense which reportedly has been committed by the U.S. Government against General Wessin. Its adoption, however, would at least indicate to the world that the Congress of the United States was not sympathetic to, and did not endorse, the abusive type of activity reportedly committed by the U.S. Government in this instance.

Mr. President, I do not know General Wessin y Wessin. I have never met him, nor have I ever been in contact with him, directly or indirectly. I do feel that the Congress has an obligation to require of the officials and agents of the U.S. Government that the rights of individuals be respected, whoever the individuals are, and of whatever nationality they may be.

Mr. President, I urge that the Senate adopt this amendment.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, Sept. 10, 1965]
SHOWDOWN NEARS IN SANTO DOMINGO—REGIME AIDE CALLS WESSIN OBSTACLE TO NORMALCY

(By Paul Hofmann)

SANTO DOMINGO, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, September 9.—Suspense gripped Dominicans today as a showdown between the new provisional government and armed forces chiefs seemed to be approaching.

At the center of uncertainty was Brig. Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin, commander of the controversial Armed Forces Training Center. The center's brigade of frontline troops and at least a dozen tanks were still a formidable factor in the Dominican situation after having fought the rebels in the civil war, which formally ended last week.

Provisional President Hector Garcia-Godoy conferred most of the day with U.S. officials and Dominican military commanders at his private residence, discussing how to assert his authority over all the Dominican Armed Forces.

An aide to Dr. Garcia-Godoy said that "General Wessin is the obstacle" to normal Government activity. The aide declared that as long as the general's status was undefined, "much Government business remains at a standstill." The official suggested that the Provisional President's "private talks" might lead to an arrangement with General Wessin.

Rebel leaders have served notice on the provisional government that they consider General Wessin's removal the price of their collaboration in disarming civilians. The reconciliation accord signed here last week under Organization of American States auspices provided that the recovery of arms in

the hands of civilians in the rebel zone of Santo Domingo start immediately, and it did not mention any condition.

Virtually no rebel arms have so far been surrendered to the provisional government. The rebels insist they feel threatened as long as General Wessin and like-minded military chiefs remain in command of well-armed troops.

Last night there was some shooting in the rebel zone but nobody appeared to have been hurt. The Inter-American Peace Force received a telephone call assuring it that the rebels meant no harm and were just firing their rifles into the air to celebrate their "farewell to arms." However, the arms remained in rebel hands today.

During the night it was rumored that General Wessin had been or was about to be arrested at his headquarters at the San Isidro air base, 10 miles northeast of Santo Domingo. The rumors were unfounded.

HE DISCLOSES OFFER

General Wessin had alleged that U.S. officials tried to bribe him to leave the country. This morning he disclosed that Dr. Garcia-Godoy had summoned him to the Presidential Palace during the night to offer him "any diplomatic post abroad" if he was ready to leave the country.

The general said that a U.S. official had been present when the Provisional President pleaded with him to go abroad. He added that he had promised an answer today after consulting with his troops.

Those consulted by President Garcia-Godoy during the day included Ellsworth Bunker, the U.S. member of the OAS peacemaking commission, and the U.S. Ambassador W. Tapley Bennett, Jr.

In the rebel sector about 200 youngsters demonstrated against alleged brutality by Dominican Armed Forces officers.

The rebellion erupted April 24 with the proclaimed * * * restoring Juan Bosch, who had been ousted in 1963, to the Presidency. The government of Donald Reid Cabral was deposed during the revolt and the rebels and their military opponents both set up regimes, which resigned under the reconciliation accord in favor of the provisional government.

In the early days of the revolt the United States landed troops in the Dominican Republic. The troops later were incorporated into an Inter-American Peace Force.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Sept. 9, 1965]

DOMINICAN REPORTS U.S. BRIBE OFFER—GENERAL SAYS OFFICIALS WANT HIM TO GET OUT OF COUNTRY

SANTO DOMINGO, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, September 8.—Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin said today two U.S. Embassy officials told him he would lack for nothing if he agreed to leave the Dominican Republic.

The rebels are trying to get Wessin, who led the armed forces against them when the revolution broke out last April, out of the country.

The general said the Embassy officials offered to purchase his home for \$50,000, and said he could have military attaché jobs in Paris or Madrid. He said he declined the offer.

The U.S. Embassy said there would be no comment immediately but it might have something to say later.

REBELS DEMAND REMOVAL

Wessin emphasized he would not retire from the Army until the Dominican situation had become normal and an elected government was in power.

Wessin's remarks came amid speculation the provisional government headed by President Hector Garcia-Godoy was about to retire him or transfer him to some diplomatic job abroad.

Rebel leaders and sympathizers are demanding the removal of Wessin, 42, claiming

he ordered the bombing of innocent civilians at the height of the Dominican fighting last April. Wessin has said only rebel military positions were attacked.

DISARMING AT STANDSTILL

Top rebel officials recently have said the success of the civilian disarmament program under the Organization of American States peace formula depends on Wessin's future status. The disarming of civilians in the rebel zone is reported to be at a standstill.

The general, who entered the service as a private in 1944, said four different attempts at what he called bribery were made by American officials, the last one during the past week.

Talking to reporters at his headquarters at San Isidro Air Base, the general declined to reveal the identity of the two persons involved in the first two attempts because, he said, he held them in the highest esteem.

IMPROPER HOUR

The persons calling him last week, he said, were David Phillips, whom he identified as an agent of the Central Intelligence Agency, and Lt. Col. Joseph William Weyrick, Army attaché.

"They came at midnight," said Wessin, "an improper hour to call on a humble Dominican home. Phillips did not say he was with the CIA, but I checked that later and was told that he was.

"He offered to purchase my home and said I would be a guest of honor at the American installations in Panama. He said I could visit all U.S. Army posts and proposed that I could be military attaché in Madrid or military attaché in Paris. He assured me I would lack nothing.

"It's interesting to point out that I am quite willing to sell my home to anyone who wants to give me \$50,000 for it because it isn't worth it. But with that money I would immediately build another home in this country."

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Sept. 10, 1965]

WESSIN OUSTED, REPORTED NAMED CONSUL IN MIAMI

SANTO DOMINGO, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, September 9.—Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin was taken by armed escorts to a waiting U.S. military plane tonight and flown out of the Dominican Republic.

President Hector Garcia-Godoy then took to radio and television to announce he had appointed the militant anti-Communist leader consul-general in Miami, Fla.

IN LINE WITH OFFER

The new job appeared to be in line with the President's offer yesterday to give Wessin y Wessin, leader of the coup that ousted President Juan D. Bosch in 1963, any job he wanted abroad if he would get out of the country.

At the same time, Garcia-Godoy said there would be no further changes in the country's armed forces. This was taken to mean that Comodoro Francisco Rivera Caminero had been confirmed as Secretary of the Armed Forces.

The provisional government had puzzled all day over what to do with Wessin y Wessin, who had refused the President's job abroad offer.

The rebels had demanded his ouster as commander of the armed forces training center as part of their price for a peace settlement. Rebel leaders said they could not undertake disarmament on their side until he left.

The rebels accused Wessin y Wessin of having ordered the bombing of Santo Domingo during last April's fighting, and they called it genocide. Wessin y Wessin denied the charge.

September 22, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

23865

ESCORTED TO CAR

The climax came during the evening when the top officers of the inter-American peace force here, Brazilian Gen. Hugo Panasco Alvin, and U.S. Lt. Gen. Bruce Palmer, Jr., called on Wessin y Wessin at his home.

They were accompanied by Commodore Rivera.

They all talked together for about 50 minutes.

Wessin y Wessin emerged in his green fatigue uniform, hatless and unarmed, and was escorted to a waiting car filled with unidentified Dominican army officers.

They drove him to U.S. 82d Airborne Division headquarters at San Isidro Air Base and from there he was whisked to the four-engine transport which had been waiting 6 hours.

He tried to hide his face as he was escorted to the plane. Four Dominican officers went as far as the plane's door with him then returned.

A spokesman said the plane's destination was the Panama Canal Zone.

In his speech, Garcia-Godoy said Wessin y Wessin had retired from the armed forces and accepted the consular position.

RELUCTANT TO MOVE

Garcia-Godoy was reluctant to move against the general because of his wide following among the military and among politicians who regarded him as a bulwark against communism.

Authorities sources said Ellsworth Bunker, U.S. Ambassador, and General Palmer were present when the President offered the diplomatic job. Wessin y Wessin himself claimed two members of the U.S. Embassy offered him \$50,000 for his home plus a job abroad if he would get out of the country. He said his home was worth only half that.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Sept. 13, 1965]

WESSIN BLAMES REDS FOR OUSTER

MIAMI, FLA.—Brig. Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin, charging that Communists were responsible for his ouster, has agreed to assume duties here in a diplomatic post for the Dominican Republic's provisional government.

Stripped of his command of the armed forces training center, Wessin arrived Friday night after an abrupt and unceremonious departure from his home in Santo Domingo. He flew here in a U.S. Air Force plane from Panama.

In his first meeting with newsmen since the provisional government ousted him as part of the price of peace, Wessin said his removal was "a victory for the Communists." He added, "They haven't knocked me out yet."

"I will serve (as consul general) but in the meantime we are not finished with the Communists in the Dominican Republic, so I can't be happy."

Wessin led the 1963 military coup that overthrew President Juan D. Bosch. He commanded the army during last April's revolution.

Insurgent leaders accused him of ordering the indiscriminate bombing of civilians in the rebel sector of Santo Domingo. Wessin denied the charge, saying military targets only were bombed.

His ouster was demanded by the insurgents as part of their price for a peace settlement.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Sept. 15, 1965]

WESSIN BLASTS AMERICAN POLICY

MIAMI, FLA., September 14.—The Dominican Republic's Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin said tonight he was expelled from his country by a U.S. Army lieutenant who held a bayonet at his back.

The militant anti-Communist said he was not even given time to get his passport or see his family.

In his six-page letter to the new government in Santo Domingo announcing he would not take a job as consul general here, Wessin y Wessin also blasted U.S. policy in his homeland.

"The American official who ordered my expulsion in such a humiliating way has given the coupe de grace to the fight for democracy in Latin America," said Wessin y Wessin.

"Can you imagine how the Latin military men feel now?" Wessin y Wessin asked.

The letter was dated September 10, the day he arrived in Miami on a forced trip from Santo Domingo via Panama in a U.S. Air Force plane.

"An elementary sense of honor as a military man prevents me from accepting the appointment of general consul in Miami from a government which has used foreign troops to exile me by force," he said.

He said he didn't want to criticize all Americans, "but I hope and I trust that very soon there will be a change in the American policies concerning my country."

[From the New York Times, Sept. 11, 1965]
REBELS UNMOVED BY WESSIN'S EXILE—THEY REFUSE TO YIELD ARMS TILL OTHER GENERALS LEAVE

(By Paul Hofmann)

SANTO DOMINGO, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, September 10.—Dominican leftist leaders said today that the departure of Brig. Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin from the country was not a sufficient concession for the surrender of their arms to the provisional government.

La Patria, newspaper of the rebel movement, charged in an editorial that the provisional President, Dr. Hector Garcia-Godoy, had "rewarded" General Wessin by appointing him Consul General in Miami. General Wessin has been the leftist' leading enemy since last April and May, when he rallied rightwing forces to combat the revolution.

La Patria criticized Dr. Garcia-Godoy for his declaration, issued last night in a broadcast to the nation, that for the time being no other military leaders would be replaced.

General Wessin left the country last night aboard a U.S. transport plane. U.S. officials and military officers had been increasingly active in the last few days in persuading the general to go abroad.

OTHER COMMANDS INTACT

The cooperation of other Dominican military chiefs was obtained with an understanding that they would, at least provisionally, retain their commands. Dr. Garcia-Godoy and his advisers appeared to hope that the departure of General Wessin would prompt leftist civilians to give up their arms.

Under the reconciliation act that was signed last week by the rebels and the Dominican junta, the provisional government was charged with starting "at once" to recover the many weapons in the hands of civilians, most of them in the downtown rebel sector of Santo Domingo.

In the last few days, public displays of weapons in the downtown area have gradually diminished. Some military and paramilitary rebel formations have withdrawn the arms from their members, but none of the weapons have been handed over to the new government.

In his broadcast, Dr. Garcia-Godoy pledged to safeguard civil rights and disclosed that he had ordered the armed forces to withdraw to their quarters. The order affects especially the troops that were under General Wessin's command. Some of the forces have started leaving the northern parts of the capital, where they had been stationed a short distance from the rebel zone.

While Communists and other extreme leftists kept pressing the provisional government for more measures to curb the armed forces, moderate leaders appeared willing to give Dr. Garcia-Godoy credit for having tried to assert his authority and bring about a reconciliation. An attempt to stage an anti-Government demonstration in the rebel zone in the morning attracted only a few dozen youngsters.

There are signs that the Dominican Revolutionary Party of former President Juan Bosch is appraising Dr. Garcia-Godoy's efforts more positively than are the rebel extremists. Dr. Bosch was expected to return from exile Sunday, but it is now suggested that he may prefer to return September 25, on the second anniversary of his ouster by the armed forces.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 11, 1965]

WESSIN IN CANAL ZONE

BALBOA, CANAL ZONE, September 10.—Brigadier General Wessin arrived in the Canal Zone from Santo Domingo today aboard a U.S. Air Force plane. He later left for Miami after staying at a U.S. Army guest house in Fort Amador, on the bank of the Panama Canal near Balboa.

[From the Pompano Beach (Fla.) Sun Sentinel, Sept. 15, 1965]

WESSIN SAYS OUSTER BACKED BY BAYONET—UNITED STATES ROLE IN SWITCH BLISTERED

MIAMI.—Ousted Dominican Gen. Elias Wessin, breaking a 4-day silence since his arrival here, Tuesday night rejected the post of consul in Miami and released a blistering attack on the United States.

In a 6-page letter to provisional President Hector Garcia-Godoy, Wessin said he was "deported from my country with a bayonet at my back" by American forces last Thursday night.

"The American officials who ordered my expulsion from Dominican territory in such a humiliating manner have given the coup d'grace to the fight for democracy in the Americas," the letter said.

"Can you imagine the impact this action against my person on the part of the OAS (Organization of American States) and the U.S. Government will have on Latin American military men?" the letter asked.

The letter, dated September 10, was written shortly after Wessin's arrival here last Friday night aboard a U.S. military plane from the Panama Canal Zone. Wessin had been mysteriously flown to the Canal Zone from Santo Domingo in another U.S. military plane 24 hours before.

Wessin said he withheld release of the letter until now to assure time for its delivery to Garcia-Godoy by a personal courier.

Copies of the letter also were sent to Brazilian Gen. Hugo Panasco Alvin, commander in chief of the inter-American peace forces in Santo Domingo; Lt. Gen. Bruce Palmer, the top U.S. military commander there; Ellsworth Bunker, U.S. member of the special OAS negotiating team, and to the commander of the U.S. airborne forces in the Dominican Republic.

Wessin said that Generals Alvin and Palmer told him that he was to become consul in Miami.

"An elementary sense of honor as a military man prevents me from accepting the post of consul general in Miami from a government which has allowed foreign troops to send me into exile by force," he said in the letter.

"I told this to Generals Alvin and Palmer when they told me that I was consul in Miami."

"The afternoon when General Alvin and Palmer informed me that I had to go and a U.S. Army lieutenant prevented me from go-

ing to my home to get my clothes and my passport I firmly decided not to serve your government, not in the Miami Consulate or in any other post."

By ousting him, Wessin said American troops were guilty of "making common cause with the enemies (the Communists) of democracy" and said the action did not benefit "those who say they are the leaders in the fight for the survival of the Western World."

The general said he was here without money and without passport. "But I maintain my dignity and my name."

"My departure from our country portends grave happenings for the cause of democracy," he warned. "What Dominican military man, who respects himself, will be willing to assume responsibilities when communism launches its final attack against our nation?"

To accept the consulate here, he said, "would be to place myself at the service of a government which has betrayed Dominican democracy and would constitute disloyalty to those brave soldiers and officers who stood by me in those tragic days when blood soaked the soil of our fatherland."

Despite his angry blast at the United States, Wessin said he did not want to give "ammunition" to the Communists to use against the United States.

He said he "repudiates the action of those bad Americans who are causing this great nation to lose prestige, and I trust there soon will be salutary rectification concerning the mistaken policy which has been followed in my country."

Wessin cautioned Garcia that any "injustices" against members of the Dominican Armed Forces will bring two consequences.

[From U.S. News & World Report]

DOMINICAN PUZZLE—HAS UNITED STATES TURNED OVER A NATION TO THE REDS?—TWO SIDES

(NOTE.—In April, President Johnson rushed marines to the Dominican Republic to save American lives, prevent Reds from taking over a revolution. Five months later, a temporary Dominican President is in office. United States has exiled the leader of anti-Communist military forces. The Communists continue to wield considerable power. And American troops are still there to guard an uncertain truce. This question is raised: Who really won in the Dominican Republic—United States or Communists? Howard Handelman of U.S. News & World Report, who has covered the Dominican crisis from the start, gives the inside story.)

SANTO DOMINGO.—This is the story of the first days under the new Government of the Dominican Republic. That Government, headed by Héctor Garcia Godoy, was set up on September 3 under a compromise arranged by the Organization of American States.

During the days that followed, the rebels seemed to be having things all their own way. They retained control of their own zone—downtown Santo Domingo. Government police and troops didn't even try to get in. They retained control of their arms—thousands of rifles and machineguns that they captured in the first days of the revolution, back in April.

The antirebel station run by the military at the San Isidro airbase was ordered off the air. There was no other voice to counter the Communist propaganda of the newspaper *Patria*, published in the rebel zone.

Rebel officials got jobs in the Government of Garcia Godoy, including Cabinet posts. Rebels made demands on Garcia Godoy—he made no public demands on them.

Brig. Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin, dedicated anti-Communist, was hustled out of the country in an American Air Force transport plane.

The General was put aboard under the watchful eye of five armed FBI agents and

a large detachment from the 82d Airborne Division.

The whole atmosphere was one of rebel, or Communist, victory.

Downtown, in the rebel zone, people sang revolutionary songs. Groups of rebel warriors marched through the streets chanting revolutionary slogans.

In contrast, outside the rebel zone, there were no such celebrations or victory claims.

Instead, there was gloom. Some American businessmen pulled up stakes and left. Others requested transfers, or tried to settle their affairs so they could leave. Dominican anti-Communists, too, were down in the mouth. Some diplomats, from Europe and Latin America, were convinced that all was lost to the Communists.

As an example of the general gloom, an American resident told me: "You are here for a historic event—the first time that the American Army occupied a country in order to turn it over to the Communists."

A DIPLOMAT'S VIEW

One important Ambassador of a non-Latin country said:

"Please tell me one single thing that is better for your country now than it was last April, when you sent in the marines. The Communists are stronger now than they ever have been in this country. They have come out in the open, publish their own newspaper, hold conventions, even call themselves Communist, openly.

"All the concessions are being made to the Communists—none to the other side. The rebels signed the compromise agreement to settle the civil war—but now they ask for more concessions before they will live up to their agreements. First it was Wessin y Wessin. Next it will be the other military chiefs. Already, the street mobs are demanding that they go. They are calling your Ambassador, Mr. W. Tapley Bennett, a Nazi—and demanding that he be kicked out.

"Their gall is enormous. In one edition of *Patria*, the Communists bragged in one statement that they were the power in the revolution—and, in another column, attacked Mr. Bennett for saying in April that Communists were threatening to seize control of the revolution.

"In these months of revolution, the Communists have built up their political and military apparatus far beyond anything they ever had here before.

"Also, the rebels now have the mystique—the glamor and prestige that go with standing up to the giants of the hemisphere and the world—the Yankees. They have the heroes and the legends and the slogans and the songs. They think they have won this revolution.

"I am afraid they are right."

This Ambassador knows what the Americans are trying to do here—divide the rebels and then conquer them. He just doesn't think it will work. The Americans believe their formula does have a chance to work.

WHAT THE REBELS DIDN'T GET

To American officials, rebel gains at this point seem more apparent than real. The first job was to clean house on the right. Now the rebel turn is coming.

Rebels have not been granted any one of their fundamental demands.

The America's officials say this:

When talks about a compromise settlement opened, the rebels plopped six basic demands on the table. Not a single one was accepted. The demands were:

Withdraw the Inter-American Peace Force immediately.

Fire all Dominican military chiefs of staff.

Name a rebel officer as Dominican Army Chief of Staff.

Let the military men who joined the rebels return to their services with the advanced ranks to which the rebels promoted them.

Restore the 1963 constitution of Juan Bosch.

Reseat the Congress elected in the Bosch sweep of 1962.

Acceptance of these demands would have meant a rebel victory. The United States is pleased that a compromise was signed—without giving in on any one of these demands.

The Inter-American Peace Force troops stay, indefinitely. The military chiefs of staff stay, at least for now. Wessin was not a chief of staff.

The Juan Bosch constitution is not accepted—and a new one is to be written.

No rebel officer gets high command. Officers who fought for the rebels return to the military—with the ranks they held on April 24, not with the ranks the rebels gave them. A new Congress is to be elected.

Biggest thing working against the Communists, in the U.S. view, is the continued presence of 82d Airborne Division troops. American officials here, privately, express the hope that the troopers will be kept here at least for the 9 months that the provisional government of Garcia Godoy is in power.

A START BY GARCIA GODOY

American officials are pleased with the start Garcia Godoy has made. He is anti-Communist. He is consolidating his position with the military and explained to officers in advance why he had to get rid of Wessin. He is firming up ties with the influential "Santiago group" of businessmen. Early in the summer, United States tried to help this group form a provisional government. Now the United States is pleased that the group is helping Garcia Godoy.

Among the things U.S. officials like about Garcia Godoy are:

His firm stand against General Wessin. One U.S. official summed up American objections to Wessin by saying, "He is so rigidly anti-Communist that he creates more Communists than he destroys."

Garcia Godoy's efforts to weaken the rebel side by giving good Government jobs to rebels who show signs of concern about Communist power downtown. These former rebels are watched carefully during their period of "rehabilitation." One already has been kicked out of the job of running the Government radio-TV station.

Garcia Godoy's care to avoid actions so drastic that they carry too much risk of touching off new fighting.

The U.S. objective is to destroy the Communist power—without getting into another shooting war. Idea is to break the rebel hold on the downtown section, and have as many guns collected as possible, before even considering armed action. Garcia Godoy shares these objectives.

United States is willing to wait a week or two to break the rebel hold on downtown, and collect guns. But it is recognized that, in the end, it may be necessary to send in Dominican troops and search every house for weapons.

Possibility of a pitched battle between Communist and non-Communist forces inside the rebel camp is not ruled out. There have been gunfights between these forces inside the rebel zone from time to time.

ACE IN THE HOLE?

As a result, there now is a tendency among American officials to look on the rebel "president," Col. Francisco Caamaño Deñó, as an ace in the hole, on our side.

Conviction is that Caamaño doesn't want the Communists to grab power any more than Garcia Godoy does.

Caamaño pledged that he would begin delivering guns soon. He also, according to U.S. officials, has gone back into the Army—and accepts Garcia Godoy as his commander in chief.

September 22, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

23867

Others share the growing conviction that Caamaño will turn out to be an important factor against communism.

A Dominican nationalist, prorebel and anti-Yankee, says: "One of the strange things about this situation is that the only man who can save this country from communism, for you Yankees, is Caamaño—and I think he will."

A ROLE FOR REVOLUTIONISTS?

The role of Caamaño is just one of the things that make the Dominican problem so complicated. Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker, member of the OAS ad hoc committee that arranged the compromise settlement, has confided to several people that this has been the most complex problem which he ever has tackled.

The reasons are multiple—and obvious.

Thirty years of Trujillo's dictatorship, to start with, sapped the spirit of the whole people. It was difficult to find anybody who would make a decision or take a stand.

The rebel forces were split into a number of splinter groups—moderates and non-Communist nationalists of various persuasions, plus Communists who follows the Chinese, Moscow or Castro lines and fight among themselves.

On the other side, there was a lack of political effectiveness.

Old Trujillistas tried to muscle in, and did gain influence over the junta president, Gen. Antonio Imbert Barreras. Old militarists jealously guarded their power and privilege.

Economically, the country is shot.

Cheating on the Government was a national pastime. Contraband was smuggled in by the military—and merchants. For political reasons, leaders who came after Trujillo inflated wages. At the same time, the props were knocked from under the Dominican export business by the collapse of world market prices for sugar, coffee and cacao.

To straighten out the mess, it now seems clear, the United States will have to remain deeply involved in Dominican internal affairs for a long time to come.

Economically, the United States is going to have to keep the country afloat.

Politically, the United States already is deeply involved. President Garcia Godoy already is getting political advice from U.S. officials here—although he does not accept it all.

As an example, U.S. officials have objected to several appointments Garcia Godoy has made to his Cabinet, or to other high Government jobs. Garcia Godoy has rejected the U.S. protests, for the most part.

One of his main explanations to American officials who object is this: Non-Communists in the rebel camp must not be isolated, forced to side with the Communists. They must be given another way to go. He wants to offer them that "other way."

Therefore, he says, he is appointing as many moderates and non-Communists, from the rebel camp, as he can.

American officials are not 100 percent satisfied that this tactic will work—but are willing to let Garcia Godoy give it a try. After all, American troops still are in the country, as insurance against a Communist takeover.

The Garcia Godoy tactic is to divide and conquer—which is the U.S. tactic here, too.

THE DOUBLECROSS: A WAY OF LIFE

Involved in this tactic, of course, is the grand old practice of the doublecross. And the doublecross is a grand old Dominican habit, from way back. It is even contagious. Americans have caught the spirit, here, from time to time.

Some examples of the doublecross in this revolution:

Before the revolution, Imbert feared that former President Joaquin Balaguer, his political enemy, planned a coup. Imbert, though an anti-Communist, made a deal

with the Castorite 14th of June movement—even gave it arms.

During the first week in May, the U.S. decided Imbert was the man to form an anti-Communist junta. Former Ambassador John Bartlow Martin was sent in to persuade Imbert—who really was reluctant, wanted no part of the mess. Mr. Martin denies it now, but some U.S. officials believe that he promised Imbert that the United States would recognize his junta, and help it. The United States had no such intention.

Once the junta was formed, Imbert and the military chiefs vowed to stand together to the end. Then, by accident, Imbert learned the chiefs were talking to Mr. Bunker—the OAS negotiator—behind Imbert's back.

The rebels signed two cease-fire agreements—and kept neither.

The rebels signed the compromise peace—then made new demands before they would live up to the agreement.

It's a way of life in Santo Domingo—this doublecross.

The doublecross has to be stressed for one reason. If the tradition of the doublecross is not kept firmly in mind, too much weight might be given to the present promises and agreements.

Ambassador Bunker and his OAS colleagues found this out during the months that they worked to get a compromise political settlement. Promises made one day were broken the next.

For this reason, Americans discussing the chances of getting a settlement in fact, as well as on paper, always preface their discussions with the assurance that the American Army is in the country to protect American interests, if it has to.

U.S. officials make no bones about the fact that they hope the American Army stays in the Dominican Republic for at least 9 months—the full term of the Garcia Godoy government. Some say they hope the troops stay even longer than that.

ANTICOMMUNISTS, TOO, COULD MAKE TROUBLE

Elements of future trouble are present almost everywhere. Not only are the Communists organizing action groups around the country, and stockpiling weapons, but so are anti-Communist followers of Wessin y Wessin.

In this situation, President Garcia Godoy is moving slowly. He has to, in order to avoid touching off new fighting that will blow up the whole effort to restore law and order and set up a stable government.

He would like to crack down on the Communist newspaper, *Patria*, for example. But he can't risk it right now. Instead, he hopes the two big papers, *El Caribe* and *Listin Diario*, can resume publishing as soon as possible, so the people have something to read other than Communist propaganda. The two big papers have not published since the start of the revolution. Now the unions, presumably following Communist orders, are keeping them shut down by making exorbitant demands. Unions are demanding full pay for the four months that the papers were closed and had no income. Extremists in the unions also talk of handing the papers over to worker ownership and control—although they call it "people's" ownership.

Other things, too, bother U.S. officials.

Asked whether the Dominicans would be ready for elections in 9 months, one official gave a one-word answer: "No." Juan Bosch bothers the United States, too. To the U.S. Embassy people, Bosch is bad news. They blame him for much of what has gone on this summer. To them, he was a poor administrator, as president in 1963. He did things that helped Communists, like letting some of the most dangerous return from exile. Officials say his constitution of 1963 is a horror, with wording so vague that it gives

the President almost any powers he wants to assume. He is anti-Yankee. He pits class against class. The bill of particulars against him goes on and on. Right now, it is thought, Bosch has lost a lot of political popularity. But Bosch is a spellbinder, who, in the opinion of U.S. diplomats, can win back much of his former popularity with a few speeches. Also disturbing to Americans is the return of exiled revolutionaries.

Concern was centered on Maximo Lopez Molina, president of the Chinese-line MPD, or Popular Dominican Movement. Lopez Molina had spent some time in Japan, recently moved to China, and had left China for the Dominican Republic when the provisional government was formed—or seemed certain to be formed. The Institutional Act of the provisional government, written jointly by the OAS ad hoc committee and Dominicans of both sides, bans deportation or exile. By September 7, Lopez Molina had reached Kingston, Jamaica. A way was found, next day, however, to block him. Lopez Molina was shipped to Paris, where he maintains his permanent home in exile. Other key Communists, however, have returned.

Garcia Godoy is working hand in glove with the Americans, and his goals apparently coincide with the main U.S. goals—unless, of course, there is another doublecross in the works.

U.S. officials here in Santo Domingo still talk about the beating they took from some of the U.S. press at the outset back in April, when Ambassador Bennett issued a call for the marines.

They continue to point out newly revealed evidence of Communist power within the rebel camp, to support their conclusion that U.S. intervention was necessary to save lives and keep the Communists from grabbing power.

U.S. intelligence now can demonstrate that nearly all the Communists who were listed as active when the revolt started still are important in the rebel zone.

AN INTERVIEW WITH WESSIN

Now we come to the case of Gen. Elias Wessin y Wessin. On Tuesday, September 7, the story broke that American officials had offered Wessin a bribe to leave the country.

That morning an anti-Communist Dominican newspaperman got me in to see Wessin—when four carloads of other newsmen were stopped at the outside gates.

The general said that two Americans had offered to buy his \$18,000 home—at any price he named—if he would leave the country and take a tour, as honored guest, of military establishments in Panama and the United States. Wessin said his reply was that he would sell his home for \$50,000, gladly, but that he would use the money to build another and better home, right in front of the old one.

Later that day, another high-ranking Dominican officer told me more about the case. He said that the CIA chief in Santo Domingo and an American military attaché went to Wessin's home at 2:30 a.m. on Sunday, September 5, with the bribe offer.

Next day, high U.S. officials told me a different story. They said no bribe had been offered, that Wessin initiated the meeting—but it was not at 2:30 in the morning. "It was much earlier than that." There had been other meetings, too. But Wessin asked for each of these, too.

Piecing these two stories together with some things American officials told later, I think the story is this:

United States through Garcia Godoy, put the pressure on Wessin to get out of the country. Wessin dickered, explained he was a poor man, would have to sell his home, liquidate other assets. During the negotiations Wessin initiated individual meetings. Wessin did tell me that he, himself, set the price of \$50,000 on his home.

The story of the physical ouster of Wessin, at 8:05 on the evening of Thursday, September 9, reads like a paperback spy novel. Sometime during the night of September 8-9, Wessin began moving his tanks from the northern part of Santo Domingo back toward his base. He did not inform the Inter-American military headquarters in advance.

There was panic. Ambassador Bunker was pulled out of bed before 4:30 on Thursday morning. He was out of the hotel before 7. He didn't return until 5 in the afternoon.

Wessin's moves were confusing. On Wednesday morning he went before NBC cameras and made his bribe charges openly—the same charges that he had confided secretly to me only 24 hours earlier.

At the same time, Wessin seemed to be yielding to Garcia Godoy's urging that he accept a post abroad for the good of the country. Godoy offered him his choice of several posts. Wessin said, on Wednesday, that he would consider them, and made a date to visit Godoy and give his answer on Thursday morning.

Wessin didn't show up for that date with his commander in chief.

Somebody ordered the Inter-American Peace Force into action—presumably Mr. Bunker. Brig. Gen. John R. Deane, assistant division commander of the 82d Airborne, was sent to Wessin's office. By all accounts, there was a scene. Then, Wessin was escorted to General Deane's headquarters. He was hustled out, an American officer on each arm, and whisked back to his own headquarters, a few miles away.

Later, in the afternoon, an American Air Force C-130 landed at San Isidro. Some baggage was put aboard. U.S. soldiers and plainclothesmen, presumably FBI, guarded the plane. After dark, just before 8 p.m., Wessin arrived by U.S. helicopter, was rushed aboard the airplane, and flown off to Panama. His family was left behind. One of his aides, a major, was the only Dominican to see him off.

The "bum's rush" for Wessin had some bad effects.

American residents, as well as Dominicans, began recalling how Wessin had led the forces against the rebels in the first days. A legend began to grow. Wessin was credited with saving the country from communism in the days before the marines landed. Wessin began to seem 9 feet tall.

American military officers have a more solid, less emotional, objection. Most of them had liked Wessin, and admired him as a military man. Generally, they agree his military did hold off the Communists in April until the marines landed. It is the diplomats who criticize his military actions during the first days.

But the main concern the American military men feel, as expressed by an officer who was brought in for a special high-level job, is this: For years, United States has been training Latin-American officers at Fort Gulick in Panama. These officers are indoctrinated with the idea that the United States depends on them as bulwarks against communism. What, asks the officer, are these Latin-American officers going to think about the word of the United States now?

THE REBELS CELEBRATE "VICTORY"

Meanwhile, as General Wessin was being stripped of his military rank, retired from the Army and forced out of the country by the Americans, the rebels were celebrating their "victory."

At rebel headquarters, in the Copello Building on the main business street, El Conde, I talked with Bill Bailes, an American airplane pilot who has been with the rebels almost from the start.

We commented on how the guns had all but disappeared from the streets of the rebel zone. Mr. Bailes said the guns were still there—that the night before, when rumors

spread that Wessin was going to invade, guns sprouted everywhere in the streets.

Mr. Bailes was exuberant with what he believes is a rebel victory. He praised the job that had been done by the "American press."

He said, "You reporters saw through the brainwashing of the American Government," and then added, jokingly: "I am recommending that we strike a medal for the American reporters who covered this story."

One of the sources of strength Garcia Godoy hopes to keep, as a counter to the Communists in the rebel forces, is the military.

As of mid-July, the Dominican armed forces had the following strength figures: 10,000 army; 3,800 air force; 3,600 navy; more than 10,000 in national police; 1,700 in Wessin's armed forces training center.

I talked with high-ranking military officers, many of whom were gloomy.

One in particular I had seen several times, in May and July, when the purely military situation was much worse than it is now. But never had I seen him so gloomy.

This officer said:

"The situation is worse than anytime since April.

"During April and May, and into June, you at least could have faith in something—the military effort against communism. Now, even that faith has been shattered. United States seemed to be against the Communists then. Now it doesn't seem to be. United States instead seems to be protecting the Communists.

"Exiled revolutionaries are coming back. Arms are not being collected.

"One provisional government, Imbert's, is out and another one is in—but still the Communists keep their control of downtown Santo Domingo. What did the compromise agreement accomplish?

"The Communists publish their newspapers—but the anti-Communists are ordered off the air, and have no newspapers."

The officer was puzzled by the United States—and said that he felt betrayed, adding:

"We cannot understand your Government. You send thousands to fight communism in Vietnam—but give in to the Communists here."

Neither does this officer think that all the rebel guns will be surrendered or found. He said 2,500 weapons were found in the northern part of the city, after the junta victory in May—but that many others still are there, hidden too well or too deeply to be detected. How many more are being hidden downtown, or in the rest of the country the officer would not try to guess.

AN ECONOMIC PROBLEM

United States now has not only the political and military problems, but the formidable economic problem as well.

Here are some aspects of the aid problem: Government budget runs \$15 million a month. Collections fell to \$2 million in May, got up to \$9 million in September, are not expected to reach \$15 million before many months.

Sugar Corporation, Government-owned, loses money and has to borrow \$16 to \$18 million a year to operate. Production costs are higher than the low world prices.

Coffee, a prime export, is in trouble. A few years ago, the Dominican Republic cheated on the World Coffee Agreement, exported more than its quota. Now, it is being penalized. In addition, coffee prices on the world market are very low. Result is that the little coffee growers, out in the countryside, aren't able to sell their coffee beans—and don't understand why. That poses a political problem of Garcia Godoy—and the United States.

Cacao prices are down on the world market.

Since Trujillo, the Dominican Republic has been importing more than it can afford. Trujillo was killed in 1961. He had kept a tight rein on imports, showed a yearly favorable balance in current trade accounts. The figures tell the story. Current trade balances, year by year, were: 1960—plus \$42.6 million; 1961—plus \$41.8 million; 1962—minus \$13.5 million; 1963—minus \$22.8 million; 1964—minus \$55.7 million.

All these problems are manageable, however, compared to the really big one:

This has been a country of easy living. People didn't need peso incomes to live. They could pick bananas and get along. But now that's not good enough for them. They want TV sets, and pesos in their pockets. They want schools for their children, and hospitals. Other people have these things, and they want them too. Only problem is that, while they want the benefits that come from a money economy, they don't really understand yet that they have to work for what they get.

Against these problems, and others, the U.S. mission for the Agency for International Development went to work on estimates of what was needed.

The mission came up with an estimate of 30 millions, to start with. It recommended that United States chip in 20 millions, the Dominican Republic the other 10 millions. President Johnson agreed, announced his \$20-million aid program.

Initial planning calls for use of the money in these ways:

Help make up the budget deficits, in monthly operating costs.

Pay half the 1-month salary bonus that all Government employees get in December.

Throw in some money to help rehabilitate manufacturing and business, generally—but not to help commerce.

Finance public works projects. Many already are underway, like the new water system being constructed for Santo Domingo. But in addition, Garcia Godoy is being given a "pot" of 2 millions to throw into public works in areas where it will do the most good politically. Idea is that United States wants Garcia Godoy to succeed, so U.S. money is being given to him to use for semipolitical purposes.

On September 5, 2 days after the Garcia Godoy government took office, the AID people went over the books with the government. The Dominicans were surprised. They were "wealthier" than they had imagined.

They hadn't heard about President Johnson's promise of \$20 million—because there are no newspapers of general information in the capital.

But, in addition to that, they found that they had: 32 millions in loans negotiated by previous governments, but never drawn; 20 to 30 millions in new loans that will be available to finance projects the AID mission now is developing; 6.5 millions in OAS emergency aid that has not been spent yet.

Total aid given since April 24 ran to 42 millions. This was U.S. money, most of which was funneled through OAS.

One reason that 6.5 millions of this aid money has not yet been spent is that United States now is keeping a closer watch than ever on what is done with aid dollars in the Dominican Republic. In the past, officials say, much of the aid money went down the drain, in stopgap measures.

Now, the United States intends to be tougher, and make certain that aid extended will help make it possible to end aid later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I sincerely hope that my good friend the senior Senator from South Carolina will not press his amendment.

The Senator from South Carolina makes out a fairly strong case in favor of General Wessin y Wessin. His amendment, however, is an illustration of the fact that it is unwise to pass a general law based on one specific instance.

Under the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina, any person who was involuntarily brought into the United States by the United States or its agents could not be deported. This amendment would cover all persons brought into the United States under those circumstances except prisoners of war.

Frequently the U.S. Coast Guard has the task of preventing smuggling. We have statutes against piracy on the high seas. The way in which this amendment is phrased, it would go far beyond the case of General Wessin y Wessin.

If the Coast Guard were to catch smugglers off the U.S. Coast, against whom they had a case based upon evidence of prior acts, and if the smugglers were brought to our country against their will, even though the smugglers were aliens, they could never be deported from the United States under this amendment.

The same thing would apply to pirates who were aliens and happened to be apprehended by agents of the American Government off the coast of the United States or elsewhere on the high seas.

I suggest to my good friend, the Senator from South Carolina the advisability of withholding his amendment and introducing a separate bill to cover the case of General Wessin y Wessin.

The Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Committee on the Judiciary has jurisdiction of bills which are introduced in behalf of special individuals who are subject to deportation under the general laws. The subcommittee constantly acts on such bills for special individuals in individual cases.

I sincerely hope that the Senator from South Carolina will withdraw his amendment and introduce a special bill to cover General Wessin y Wessin.

There are several members of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization present in the Chamber. I am certain that they will join me in assuring the Senator from South Carolina that we would give careful consideration to the case of General Wessin y Wessin in the event the Senator were to see fit to introduce a special bill to take care of his situation. I believe that would be a safer course to follow.

The amendment has not been considered by the subcommittee. The subcommittee has had no opportunity to study the amendment. Certainly the amendment would be subject to the interpretation which I mentioned, which interpretation would prevent the United States from deporting people who come into the U.S. waters or into our country in violation of the laws against smuggling or piracy, if we were to apprehend them on the high seas.

I hope the Senator from South Carolina will not press his amendment, but, on the contrary, will introduce a special bill for the benefit of Gen. Wessin y Wessin.

I give the Senator my assurance as a member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Committee on the Judiciary that I shall give consideration to the merits of the case of Gen. Wessin y Wessin.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that the Coast Guard may arrest anyone within our 3-mile limit. That is considered within the waters of the United States, and it would appear that the persons in the Senator's example would be voluntarily within the area of the United States. If they are beyond the national waters of the United States, I do not know of any authority we have to bring them in here. In view of that lack of authority, I do not believe such an amendment would be necessary.

However, if there is any question about it, if the Senator wishes to offer an amendment or would support such an amendment if I offered it, I should be pleased to hear from the manager of the bill as to his views with regard to such an amendment.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, in spite of the suggestion of the Senator from South Carolina, the Senator, by his act in modifying his own amendment, has shown that his amendment is subject to further scrutiny and should be further scrutinized.

We have in our laws the doctrine of hot pursuit, relating to smuggling; and under the Senator's amendment, if we followed smugglers outside the 3-mile limit into the ocean and captured them and brought them back here for trial in our courts, they would have a right to remain in the United States, under the amendment, until they shuffled off this mortal coil.

I am not sufficiently gifted in drafting to draft an amendment on the spur of the moment. I only wish the Senator from South Carolina would save us further labor on the point by withdrawing his amendment, and then introducing a special bill for the relief of one man. Whether or not we are able to develop a good case for the relief of Gen. Wessin y Wessin, I do not think we can make out a good case for the proposition that smugglers and pirates involuntarily brought into the United States by U.S. law-enforcement agencies should be allowed to remain in this country forever, and not be subject to deportation.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is not solely to prevent General Wessin from being deported. The Wessin matter is merely an incident which illustrates well what our Government has done in this case. Our Government, at the point of a bayonet, with pistols in the man's back, forced him to come into the United States. From all indications, he did not want to come. He was brought in involuntarily.

Our position is that when our Government does that, the victim of such actions

should not be forced to leave unless he wishes to do so.

The Senator has raised a technical question and is, I think, taking a very dubious position. But I should be glad to hear from the manager of the bill as to how he feels about this matter.

Mr. ERVIN. If the Senator will pardon me, if I may be recognized 1 more minute, I remember a relatively short time ago when U.S. law enforcement forces caught a Russian fishing trawler poaching in the waters off the coast of the United States. They were arrested and brought into the United States against their will, to be tried in court.

Under the Senator's amendment, those poachers would have the right to stay in the United States forever. Many situations of that kind arise. People on rafts, picked up and brought into the United States, sometimes against their will, no matter how undesirable their character, would have the right to remain in the country. It seems to me that this is an illustration of what I have observed heretofore: We ought not to pass general law on the basis of one instance.

I agree with the Senator from South Carolina that if all the things which have been recounted in the press are true, and Gen. Wessin y Wessin has not been fairly dealt with, a bill for his relief might be appropriate if he wishes to come to the United States. But I do not believe the special remedy for such a situation is to tell all the others that they can stay here if they wish, from now on.

I do not know whether the facts reported in the newspapers are true, because I find newspapers sometimes may stretch the record; occasionally they contain about as much fiction as fact. That is the reason why we ought to have a special bill, referred to an appropriate committee, which could then investigate the truth of the press reports.

Mr. THURMOND. Of course, Mr. President, there is no intention to protect smugglers or criminals, but the Cubans to whom the Senator refers were already within U.S. waters, and they were taken to jail.

I should be pleased to hear from the manager of the bill as to his reaction to my amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina has raised a number of different points which cast doubt on the total affect of this amendment. I think all of us can remember back, not many years ago, to the time when there was a seizure of a Portuguese ship, and countries throughout the world were notified about the act of piracy which had been committed, and navies all over the world went in search of the ship.

There were people of nine different nationalities aboard that ship, being pursued by units of the U.S. Navy. What would have happened, for example, had that ship been seized and brought to the United States? Could any of the individuals who happened to be on that ship have declared that they were involuntarily brought to the United States,

September 22, 1965

and take advantage of the proposed provision?

Other questions, too, have been raised by the Senator from North Carolina. What I should like to do, knowing how strongly the Senator from South Carolina feels about the issue, is respectfully suggested that the Judiciary Committee hold a hearing on this matter next year, at least to develop, expand, and evaluate it, to see whether this is an appropriate matter for the concern and deliberation of the Senate.

I would be more than delighted to attend such a hearing and to participate in it. I have only been acting chairman of the particular subcommittee that is involved. Final determination would have to be made by our chairman.

However, I recommend to the chairman that he hold such a hearing and extend such a courtesy to the Senator from South Carolina, so that we could examine the subject in some detail and consider it and evaluate it.

I feel that the distinguished chairman of the committee will accord this courtesy to the Senator from South Carolina and to the points that he has raised.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have no desire to force action on the amendment at this time. I wished to focus attention on the subject. It involves the action by our Government in bringing a man into our country from the Dominican Republic at the point of bayonets, against his wishes, and to keep him here at the Government's will, whether he wishes to remain here or not. It is one of the most dastardly acts that has ever been committed by the U.S. Government. Those who committed the act should be required to explain it.

If the Senator in charge of the bill gives assurance that the subject will receive attention at a hearing, and the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, who is a member of the Judiciary Committee, feels the subject will receive full exploration—and I should like to hear from him on that point—I shall be willing to withdraw the amendment, to allow the Judiciary Committee to hold full hearings on the subject.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I assure my good friend from South Carolina that I shall do everything in my power to see to it that a hearing is held on such a bill if it is introduced, and that serious consideration be given to the facts to which he has referred in presenting his amendment.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in view of the assurance given by the manager of the bill, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and by the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], a member of the Judiciary Committee, I withdraw the amendment. I am sure the Judiciary Committee will consider the subject, as both Senators have indicated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

The committee amendment is open to amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator

in charge of the bill will yield to me for a moment for a question?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. I am very much interested in this bill. I am impressed with its objectives. I sympathize with all of them. I was deeply impressed with the remarks made yesterday by the Senator from Rhode Island.

In my State, many Greek and Italian families are making great contributions to the progress of South Carolina. They are outstanding citizens.

As I understand the provisions of the pending bill, it would be possible for many additional immigrants from both Greece and Italy to come into the United States—perhaps many of them to settle in South Carolina.

I recall that it was stated on the floor of the Senate yesterday that many great scientists have made valuable contributions in connection with the development of the atomic bomb; but also, when we came to the period of the hydrogen bomb, there was another distinguished Hungarian refugee, Dr. Edward Teller, who was responsible for that as well as many other great contributions to science.

For that reason, I am sympathetic with the goals established in the pending bill. One point disturbs me a great deal. I fear that the number of immigrants would be substantially increased under the provisions of the pending bill, and I wonder whether it would be possible for the Senator in charge of the bill to consider any reduction from the 170,000 as now contemplated to be authorized under the provisions of the pending bill.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Early today, I analyzed how we arrived at the 170,000 figure. Briefly, we traced it back to 1924, when the immigration bill was being considered, and the figure set then was 150,000, representing one-sixth of 1 percent of the country's population at that particular time. That figure was increased by some 8,000 as this country recognized newly independent countries and accorded them a small minimum quota. On top of the 158,000 figure, this bill increased by 10,200 the total quota numbers to take care of refugees as defined in the bill, those fleeing from Communist persecution, or fleeing from the Middle East, or natural calamities. This brought the total close to the 170,000 figure.

As the Senator from South Carolina has recognized, this figure does not include those who have close family relationships, so it probably would mean not only 170,000 but also 40,000 or 50,000 in addition because of the close family relationships.

The stress of the bill is on the reunification of families. There was a great deal of debate in the subcommittee at the time of the hearings as to what the figure should be. The figure of 170,000 was arrived at after a considerable amount of "pulling and hauling," so to speak, as to exactly what the figure should be. I believe that it really reflects, not a substantial increase in the numbers that will

come in, but the need to reunify and bring families together, as well as people of merit and ability.

At this time, I would hesitate to support any kind of amendment which would alter the basic formula of the 170,000 figure. I might mention to the Senator from South Carolina that the number of immigrants who came into this country in 1924, when this legislation first established the national origins system, represented six-tenths of 1 percent of the U.S. population.

In 1964, the number of immigrants coming into this country in relation to the population was only one-tenth of 1 percent. Therefore, I believe, as related to the total population, that the total number of immigrants has been decreasing. I would expect, with the ceilings which have been established for the 170,000, and the other restrictions which have been applied, that the percentage would constantly decrease—that is, that the number of people who will come in as immigrants compared to the total population of the United States will constantly decrease in the years ahead.

I hope that this explanation will be of some interest to the Senator from South Carolina, but at this time I would hesitate to consider any change in the total figure of 170,000.

Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina. Mr. President, I can appreciate the work which the committee has put into this legislation and in arriving at the figure of 170,000. However, I still have grave doubts about whether we should at this time increase the number of immigrants allowed into our country annually. We have an unemployment problem which we must deal with, and we should limit immigrants to those who have a real reason for coming into this country for family reasons or other pressing humanitarian reasons.

While I have an open mind about altering the national origins quota system, I do have such grave doubts about the wisdom of increasing total immigration, as this bill would do, that I will have to consider seriously casting my vote against the bill unless an amendment is adopted substantially reducing the total number of immigrants.

I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTANA in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, earlier in debate the Senator from Massachusetts, the Senator in charge of the bill, as well as the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], made comments about the attitude that they and I share with respect to the numerical ceiling on admissions from the Western Hemisphere. I believe that our views, expressed in the filed separate views in the committee report, are adequate and illustrative of our reasoning.

However, as we approach final passage of the pending bill, I wish to acknowledge concerns which have been voiced, particularly by public officials and editorials in the Dominion of Canada, Michigan, and other Northern States, which find that the Canadian who has decided to become an American makes a magnificent American citizen. There is a great community of interest on this unguarded border. I would hope that some reassurance could be voiced, as we approach a vote, to allay the fears of our Dominion neighbors.

First of all, let me say that the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] has been magnificent in working out the evolution of the bill through trying months of hearings. He was quick to respond to the basic concern of the Canadians. Initially, it had been the suggestion of the Senator from North Carolina that the Western Hemisphere ceiling be applicable to the numerical limitation on each nation in the Western Hemisphere. This would have been, indeed, a jolt to our Canadian neighbors. When I presented this problem to the Senator from North Carolina, he quickly responded—and prudently, I believe—by eliminating the 20,000 ceiling with respect to a national limitation in the Western Hemisphere.

This in itself should ease considerably the concern of our Dominion neighbors, but I believe that additionally I should make the point that I trust that the bill we are about to enact would not affect in any way the day-to-day exchange of visitors across our respective borders. Indeed, it would not affect the day-to-day entry of Canadians employed in this country. It applies only to those who would seek permanent residence and ultimate citizenship in the United States.

We shall have a thorough study made by the Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration in the next 2 years. As the Senator from Massachusetts has said, I share the hope that that Commission will give proper consideration to the implications of a Western Hemisphere ceiling.

Finally, I believe that it would be useful for the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, some editorials and expressions of opinion from outstanding Dominion newspapers and the Canadian Embassy, which expressions are most temperate.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANADIAN EMBASSY.

The Canadian Embassy presents its compliments to the Department of State and has the honor to refer to the proposed changes in the U.S. immigration laws currently under consideration in the Congress.

The Canadian Government has followed with close attention the course of discussions on the proposed new legislation in the Congress. The intimate relationship and community of interest between the Governments and people of the United States and Canada have provided the basis for a unique degree of freedom of movement of citizens of the two countries across the international border in both directions. In keeping with the traditional lack of any numerical restriction on these movements, the Canadian Government has noted with satisfaction the strong stand

taken by the administration to prevent the imposition of a ceiling of a kind which might change this situation.

It is, therefore, a matter of anxiety to Canadians that an amendment has been introduced in the Senate to limit immigration into the United States of America from the Western Hemisphere, including Canada. The adoption of such a measure by the U.S. Government would be a matter of serious concern to the Canadian Government. It would seem to place potential quantitative limitations on the movement of Canadians emigrating to the United States. It could cause particular uneasiness among persons living in border areas who may seek in future, as many have often done in the past, to take advantage of employment opportunities in neighboring parts of the other country.

It is, of course, the intention of the Canadian Government that Canadians should increasingly find full scope in Canada for the application of their talents and skills. The Canadian Government's concern is not only with the practical effect which the proposed measure might have on Canadians emigrating to the United States but also with the widespread anxiety and misunderstanding which it may cause. Moreover, the introduction of such a numerical limit would be regrettable in principle and could be regarded as setting an unfortunate precedent.

The Canadian Government finds it difficult to understand the need for a restriction of this nature and could only view it as a regressive development in the general relations between our two countries.

In the light of these considerations the Canadian Government hopes that the U.S. Government will continue to oppose strongly any proposals in the immigration legislation now under consideration in the Congress which might be regarded as having a restrictive effect on the movement of peoples between our two countries.

WASHINGTON, D.C., September 3, 1965.

[From the Toronto Globe & Mail, Aug. 31, 1965]

THE QUIET DIPLOMAT

The central theme of the Heeney-Merchant Report was that there should be free and easy consultation between the Governments of Canada and the United States before either became publicly committed to any one position, that it is in the interests of both countries that whenever possible divergent views be expressed and resolved in private through diplomatic channels. Mr. Arnold Heeney, coauthor of the report, enlarged upon this theme at Banff last week. But he had hardly finished his speech before President Lyndon B. Johnson knocked it flat. Mr. Johnson acted as if he had never heard of the Heeney-Merchant Report. In fact, by abruptly changing his administration's position on immigration from Canada and other Western Hemisphere countries, President Johnson embarrassed not only his own State Department, but left two Canadian Cabinet Ministers publicly contradicting each other. Perhaps without realizing that it was the President's go-ahead which made possible the vote by the Senate Subcommittee on Immigration to limit immigration from all countries in the Western Hemisphere to 120,000, External Affairs Minister Paul Martin said the move would be "a regressive factor in our traditional arrangements with United States insofar as the movements of our peoples are concerned." On the other hand, Mr. John R. Nicholson, Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, welcomed the bill, figuring it would slow down the emigration of Canadians to the United States, now running at about 40,000 a year.

The bill is not likely to affect the Canadian migration to the United States very much, one way or another. No national quotas are being written into the bill, so that Canadians

possessing the education, skills and training demanded of all immigrants should have little trouble competing with Latin Americans for the 120,000 annual openings. The point, however, is that President Johnson has taken action in the exceedingly sensitive field of immigration, solely on the dictates of domestic policy, and apparently without any prior consultation with Canada. It comes down to this: despite the well-intentioned recommendations of the Heeney-Merchant Report, the only quiet diplomacy is to be practiced by ourselves; the only consultation we may expect will be ex post facto.

[From the Montreal (Canada) Star, Aug. 28, 1965]

LARGELY IN THE MIND

If the proposed restriction on immigration into the United States to 120,000 annually from the Western Hemisphere becomes law, Canadians would be affected not entirely but mostly in their feelings. We are so used to going to the United States almost at will that the right to do so seems as if it were based on a law of nature. Natural law says that the people of the Western Hemisphere are all so nearly alike as makes no difference, and Canadian ideas of superiority are not relevant. Any other position amounts to discrimination, which we try to avoid in our own immigration regulations.

The practical effects of legislation on the point are difficult to forecast. They could be felt by several different classes of Canadians, those crossing the border daily to work in the United States, those crossing for periods of a few days at a time to work, those transferred by employers to plants in the United States for training, and those entering to take up permanent residence, sometimes to work, sometimes to live in retirement where small incomes go further.

But a person entering and leaving the United States daily is not an immigrant. A seasonal worker goes in because his labor is needed, persons in line for transfer by industries big enough to do that sort of thing have influential sponsors, all considerations which would tend to limit the extent of changes in existing practices.

And quite apart from these aspects of the case, it appears that there is a general error in regard to the amount of Canadian emigration to the United States. It is said to be about 10,000 annually under present conditions, some of those persons who enter the United States by way of Canada not being Canadians at all but birds of passage.

Form requires our Government to make representations, but they will not have much content.

[From the Calgary (Alberta) Herald, Sept. 2, 1965]

U.S. IMMIGRATION CHANGES

The Minister of Immigration, Hon. J. R. Nicholson, is undoubtedly right in his assessment of U.S. plans which would limit immigration from Western Hemisphere countries, including Canada, to a total of 120,000 people a year.

It is, as Mr. Nicholson suggests, hard to see how the new legislation, which has been approved by a U.S. Senate Judiciary Subcommittee, can hurt this country.

Indeed, Canada may have suffered to some extent because it was so easy for Canadians to emigrate to the United States. The financial and other types of opportunities available in the United States have been a constant attraction for well-educated and highly skilled Canadians. The migration of this type of citizen to the United States has come to be regarded deplorably in this country as the "brain drain."

The restrictions contemplated in the United States do not seem likely to bar this

September 22, 1965

type of Canadian in large numbers from U.S. citizenship. The proposed ceiling appears high enough to admit those with the highest qualifications. But, if it has the effect of encouraging at least some of the "brains" to remain and make the best of opportunities here, this country should benefit in the long run.

With these factors in mind, it is puzzling to detect an apparent difference of opinion within the Federal Cabinet on this question. Mr. Nicholson sees no harmful effects for Canada in the bill, but the External Affairs Minister, Hon. Paul Martin, regards it with misgivings.

[From the Sun (Vancouver, British Columbia), Aug. 28, 1965]

U.S. QUOTA—GOOD OR BAD?

It is understandable that there should be mixed reaction within the Canadian cabinet to the shape the U.S. new immigration policy is taking.

It comes as a shock to learn that for the first time—and with surprise approval from President Johnson—Canadian immigration to the United States may be put on a quota. This explains the affront obviously felt by External Affairs Minister Martin and his promise that representations against the proposed immigration bill will be made by Ottawa to Washington.

On the other hand we are told by Immigration Minister Nicholson that the quota "certainly would not hurt Canada." Mr. Nicholson's department has been working on a program to halt the Canadian brain-drain to the United States, so it hardly can be angry with Congress if the program is helped from that quarter.

Once we accept that in principle we would have no different status in connection with United States entry than other countries of the Western Hemisphere, we probably would find that little or nothing is changed in practice.

The United States will continue to admit all the Canadians it wants and needs according to their skills and education. Canada, if we are to believe the warnings of some most knowledgeable people, will continue to lose those citizens it needs the most.

Yet the brain-drain as a sap on the Canadian economy is not unchallenged.

A recent McGill study says the 1,000 to 1,500 Canadian professionals who emigrate south each year equal a dollar loss of \$50 to \$75 million—and that's just the cost of their training, not their possible contribution to our growth. Yet the Economic Council, balancing immigration of professionals against emigration, is confident that we come out on top.

But the Council does warn that, unless we expand efforts to attract and keep the best-trained people, the swap might not always remain favorable.

This, surely, is of larger Canadian concern than proposed U.S. immigration legislation theoretically relegating us to just another one of the crowd.

In this regard, MacMillan Bloedel's, J. V. Clyne has suggested such stay-at-home incentives to young professionals as special tax deductions; it's the take-home pay that isn't competitive, he says, not salaries.

And that sort of equalizer is something we cannot leave to the U.S. Congress.

[From the Toronto Daily Star, Aug. 30, 1965]
WHY U.S. BARRIERS TO CANADIAN EMIGRATION?

President Johnson may seriously damage Canadian-American relations by his surrender to Senate pressure for a quota system on Western Hemisphere people wishing to emigrate to the United States.

The President apparently has dismissed protests from Ottawa and from his own State Department in approving a Senate subcommittee amendment to an otherwise lib-

eral immigration bill. The amendment would limit to 120,000 a year the number of people from Latin America and Canada who want to become U.S. citizens.

This is the first time any quota has been put on Western Hemisphere immigration and presumably reflects the fear among some Republican leaders that without such restrictions the United States, in time, will be flooded with immigrants from Latin America's exploding population.

Some 40,000 Canadians emigrate to the United States each year, their entry now subject only to financial responsibility and good moral character. Canada, in return, takes in about 11,000 Americans annually without any thought of limiting their numbers.

Why should Canadian emigrants to the United States be subject to quota restrictions that are not imposed on Americans coming here?

More important is the fact that a quota system will reduce the mobility of Canadians and Americans wishing to move between our two countries, a privilege—and a useful stimulation—that has existed since the founding of the two nations.

External Affairs Minister Paul Martin noted in Canada's protest to Washington that a quota system would be a "regressive factor" in arrangements between the two countries on the movements of their citizens.

It is unfortunate that his cabinet colleague, Immigration Minister Jack Nicholson, felt compelled to make the singularly asinine comment that he welcomed the restrictions because "we've been increasingly concerned with migration to the United States and my department had intended to take steps to reverse the flow."

Just what did Mr. Nicholson intend to do? Build a Berlin wall across 3,000 miles of undefended border?

Canada's so-called "brain drain" to the United States is more than compensated by the entry of talented immigrants to this country from overseas. And, in any case, the only way to keep Canadians from leaving is to make Canadian living and working conditions more attractive.

There is no doubt the Senate bill was aimed at Latin America and not at Canada but Ottawa cannot take any particular satisfaction from that. The fact is that on a first-come-first-served basis, the Western Hemisphere quota can be filled by Latin Americans before Canadians get to the border.

Canada cannot argue against restrictions from a high moral plane in light of our own immigration laws which discriminate on an economic basis. But we can ask that the quota section of the bill be removed and that restrictions be imposed no broader than our own—that is, immigrants must have skills that will contribute to the economy.

Because it removes previous racial barriers to American immigration, President Johnson's bill will be widely approved. But it will leave a bad taste if the price of Senate passage of the bill is the downgrading of those of us who live in the rest of the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. HART. I am glad to yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. First, I thank the Senator from Michigan for his very gracious remarks concerning my activities in connection with the hearings and development of this bill.

The matter to which the Senator from Michigan has alluded illustrates, about as well as anything that has occurred, how this bill was fashioned. Personally, I am a great believer in the wisdom of the national origins quota system of the Mc-

Carran-Walter Act, and was opposed to its abolition. Frankly, I would still oppose its abolition if I had any hope of success. At the same time, I felt that there was a defect in the McCarran-Walter Act in that it provided no limitation on immigration from the Western Hemisphere. Therefore, I proposed a limitation upon immigrants from the Western Hemisphere, which, as the Senator from Michigan has so well stated, contemplated that countries of the Western Hemisphere would be placed under the same national limitation, in each case of 20,000, that the bill places upon the nations of the Eastern Hemisphere.

The Senator from Michigan called my attention very eloquently to the fact that Canada, our nearest neighbor to the north, was sending into this country in the neighborhood of 40,000 immigrants a year.

As a result of that fact, and his eloquent presentation of that fact, I did not press my proposal that, in addition to placing an overall limitation on all the nations of the Western Hemisphere, there should be a specific one of 20,000 for the people of each nation in the Western Hemisphere.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] did not favor any limitation of any kind at this time on the nations of the Western Hemisphere. The junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] has also strongly expressed his disagreement with my amendment.

In order to devise a bill that would pass, Senators, I think with great reluctance, have not pressed for the repeal of my amendment to place a 120,000 limitation upon the Western Hemisphere.

In deference to the eloquent presentation of the cause of Canada by the Senator from Michigan, I did not press my proposal that would place a limitation of 20,000 on each nation in the Western Hemisphere, in addition to the total Western hemispheric limitation of 120,000, plus families of American citizens.

As I stated to the Senate the other day, this bill represents the legislative process working in its very finest fashion. This bill is a composite bill, contributed to by many Senators on the subcommittee and the full committee.

If any one of us had written the bill by himself, he would have some changes in it. But we have a situation in which we have given and taken and adjusted our views in order to get a bill.

I honestly believe the bill in its present form as it went from the subcommittee to the full committee and as it has come from the full committee to the Senate is the very best bill obtainable at this time on this very emotional and crucial subject, the subject of immigration.

As I said the other day, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the minority leader, all of whom are now in the Chamber, and other members of the subcommittee and the full committee made most significant and substantial contributions to

the presentation to the Senate of a bill which, as I said a moment ago, represents the very finest bill attainable at the present time on this subject.

Mr. HART. I appreciate very much the completely accurate description of the evolution of this bill given by the Senator from North Carolina, and all of us are grateful to him.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTROYA in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. First, I should like to join my colleague the Senator from Michigan in the comments he has made about the words just spoken by the Senator from North Carolina. That is exactly the way the matter went. They are exactly the reasons, as referred to in the kind of references made by the Senator, for our restraint, notwithstanding our deep feelings on the subject.

I point out that not only Canada, but Mexico also is involved. Attorney General Katzenbach testified at page 16 of the House hearings that "70,000 of the 125,000 immigrants from the Western Hemisphere come from Canada and Mexico." The Senator from North Carolina had that fact in mind. Mexico sends into our country approximately 30,000 a year. It is a sensitive and important point to that country to the south of us.

I take this moment to express a plea to our neighbors in Latin America. We have not heard a great deal about this matter from Latin America. We may. Demagogues may seek to use what may result from the conference at a later time.

Let it be said, first, that there is no diminution of any kind or character in the highest rate of immigration from Latin America in recent years. The figure is now about 135,000. It has averaged at 110,000 per year for the past 10 years. As the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] pointed out, the addition provided for brings the number beyond the current range, which in 1964 was about 140,000.

Second, we are engaged in a great immigration reform. I hope our friends in Latin America, whom we number in the millions, will understand they are helping us in achieving an important reform for America's position in the world. With all due respect to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] in what he has said about the national origins quota system, it has been one of the most distasteful aspects of American foreign policy, so far as the nations of the world are concerned. Some persons may say, "What do we care what they think of us if we are right?" But, Mr. President, we are wrong. I hope the people of Latin America will understand this.

This is not a country-by-country limitation. I say to our friends in Latin America. It is a hemispheric limitation, because we consider the whole hemisphere as our partner.

Even with that limitation, we are providing for a Select Commission on West-

ern Hemisphere Immigration composed of 15 members to study this matter in the Senate version of the bill so that if dictates of policy or other ideas are deemed necessary within the next few years, the Senate is opening the door wide to discussion and to considerations which may occur in that period of time and leaving the door open as to what may be dictated by the interests not only of this country, but of the hemisphere.

We cannot stop demagogues and people who are here to disturb the relationship of the American States, but at least we can set the record straight, that within the context of this new, and I think noble, immigration policy, we have tried in every way to accommodate the special relations, affection, and friendship which exist between the United States and the people of Latin America.

I have never heard the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] say that there has been any abuse of the immigration policy from the other American Republics or from Canada, but in accordance with his view, and that which has prevailed in the totality of the proposed new law, as we are approaching a new policy, let us make it a new policy across the board.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Michigan will yield, I concur in what the Senator from New York has said to the effect that there has been no abuse in immigration from any of the countries of the Americas.

I might also state that the first bill which proposed to place a limitation upon the nations of the Western Hemisphere was introduced by one of the Senator from New York's predecessors, Senator Herbert Lehman, in 1955. At that time he said:

I say to those who criticize placing Western Hemisphere nations under the quota system—let's be fair to all. The same criteria should apply to all peoples, regardless of the place of their birth. I believe our Latin American neighbors will respect us for such a policy.

I sincerely trust that his belief will be justified.

Of the contributions made by Senators on the subcommittee and the full Judiciary Committee, some of them were contributions of omission as well as contributions of commission.

The Senator from New York deserves special praise on that point, because he was very much concerned about certain provisions of the naturalization law and certain provisions with respect to procedure in deportation cases; but he withheld amendments on those proposals because he was anxious to process a bill concerning the receipt of immigrant for permanent residence and eventual citizenship. I think his is one of the significant contributions made to this bill in that respect.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

There is a liberal provision with respect to refugees from Cuba, enabling them to regularize their status. That is an indication of the warm disposition of sympathy and favor of the United States toward other American states in the matter of immigration.

Mr. HART. I thank the Senator from North Carolina and the Senator from New York for this exchange. It clarifies the matter, it ought to reassure the Nation that we recognize the seriousness of the steps we take.

We have created a commission which I hope will, without overwhelming pressure in time, report to us an objective evaluation on the desirability or undesirability of imposing a Western Hemisphere ceiling when 1968 arrives.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. What is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

ADDRESS OF MADAM CHIANG KAI-SHEK AT SENATE LUNCHEON

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, many Members of the Senate had the privilege today of attending a luncheon in the Senate Conference Room and to hear an address by Madam Chiang Kai-shek. She is, as everyone knows, a very intelligent and gracious lady. She gave a rather brief address, but one that is thought provoking.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record at this point the address of Madam Chiang Kai-shek.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

I remember with pleasure it was some 6 years ago that I had the honor of being invited by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to lunch and to meet its members. Today I am again so honored by my Senate hosts and friends, and the presence here of so many solons who have taken the time and trouble to greet me so cordially fills my heart with warm gratitude.

In the intervening 6 years since I was last here in the United States the world has not been uneventful as you ladies and gentlemen only know too well. But, fortunately, the Republic of China, thanks to your help, has remained the guardian rock in the Western Pacific standing watch in a tossing, churning, treacherous sea.

The years before 1958 were even more paralytically eventful for the Republic of China and for all that it stands for; yet through it all you, our friends, have held on to the principles of freedom, of decency, and of morality.

Somehow in the correlation of thought and events my mind seemed to run effortlessly in focusing onto two trivia from introspective reflection of insignificant recollection, both seemingly of little import in themselves; yet they have shaped and will shape and test our manhood in the moment of truth. I give them to you here as I recall them.

Last Monday morning after laying a wreath on the tomb of the Unknown Soldier at Arlington, and the strangely haunting notes of taps pervading the quiet vastness below

brought to mind the inscription on a memorial in Kohima, Burma, erected to an un-
gainly, lonely, unprepossessing youth, Lance-
Corporal John Harmon, who won posthu-
mously the Victoria Cross in World War II.
And these were the words:

"When you go home tell them of us and say
For your tomorrow we gave our today."

The other day whilst reading a newspaper,
I came across a drawing done in charcoal
showing a primitive grave with a rifle stuck
into the mound by the bayonet mounted onto
the barrel of the gun. And on top of the
butt of the rifle was a GI's steel helmet tilted
and slightly askew with the chin straps dan-
gling loosely downward and flapping some-
what in the desolate wind, as if saying with
silent eloquence, "Well, I have given my best,
my all, my ultimate to this worthy cause."
It took but a trice for anyone looking at the
picture to know what the sketch was meant
to convey. Yet should there be any hesita-
tion as to its meaning, the caption: "No-
where Does Freedom Come Cheap" dissipated
any doubt once and for all.

Not having at all times a lazy mind, the
little wheels in my head began to spin, and
my memory raced back to the moments in
history and events seeking to pick out one—
just one instance where I could find an ex-
ception to those words in the caption "No-
where Does Freedom Come Cheap."

Could an exception be found in some of
the many epitaphs of struggles of yester-
year for freedom? Or perhaps in the tears
and blood spilt during the French Revolu-
tion? Or in the strivings for representation
and justifiable national identity in the Amer-
ican Revolution? And how about our own
revolution in China with its attendant mis-
eries, heartbreaks, and sacrifices leagued
with undaunted grandeur of spirit?—to cite
but a few instances. My mind refused to
yield one single exception where freedom had
been obtained cheaply; and I should be much
obliged if someone—anyone—could give me
one exception—just one exception—to this
inexorable and frightening truth.

For some unexplainable reason, this truth,
this thought which is nothing new, often re-
garded by the blase, the cynical, the delib-
erately biased and purposed as being trite
and shopworn, has passed through my mind
on innumerable occasions. Yet it never fails
to leave a certain sadness upon my being.
The stark reality is that neither wanting to
wish it away, nor resorting to escapism, nor
casualty, nor groveling cowardice can buy
freedom cheaply.

How poignantly sad, but true, are these
words: From nowhere, but nowhere does
freedom come cheap.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts.
Mr. President, I suggest the absence of
a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The
clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call
the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask
unanimous consent that the order for
the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. With-
out objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration
of the bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Im-
migration and Nationality Act, and for
other purposes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am
deeply indebted to the distinguished
Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KEN-
NEDY], the Senator in charge of the
pending bill, for making it possible for
me to make some concluding remarks
on it. I felt that perhaps there were
some historic items that ought to be
made a part of the record, because we
shall hear more and more about our im-
migration problems in the light of the
population expansion.

I have said on occasions that I doubted
whether we would ever be able to draft
another immigration bill without giving
top consideration to the question of ex-
panding populations all over the world.

For the moment, however, I should
like to go back to set a little background
for what is being contrived here today.

I support the bill. I supported it in
the subcommittee. I supported it in the
full committee. I shall vote affirmatively
when the roll is called on it.

However, I invite attention to the fact
that the problem of immigration goes
back to the days of the American Revolu-
tion. One of the remonstrances that
Thomas Jefferson wrote into the Decla-
ration of Independence against King
George III was that, among other things,
he obstructed naturalization and dis-
couraged migration from the Old World
to the New World.

It was, in fact, on the very day of the
Declaration of Independence, in 1776,
that the Continental Congress passed a
resolution covering into citizenship all
persons who were in the Colonies.

In the Articles of Confederation, on
the 2d of March 1781, it was declared
that the "free inhabitants shall be en-
titled to all privileges and immunities of
free citizens." When, finally, the Ar-
ticles of Confederation gave way to the
Constitution of the United States, the
Constitution, among other things, in its
delegation of power to the legislative
branch provided Congress with the
power "to establish a uniform rule of nat-
uralization." Naturalization, of course,
connotes the very fact that people will
be coming here from foreign shores. As
a consequence, the problem was how to
cover them into the citizenship of the
country. That is a power that lies in
the legislative branch and should be ex-
ercised when the occasion calls for it.

We lived with the problem of migrants
and immigration even in the days of the
War of 1812, because the British under-

took to impress what they thought were
British subjects from American vessels
and take them back to England. Even
in 1858, this practice prevailed, and Pres-
ident Buchanan had to send the Ameri-
can Navy into the Gulf of Mexico in or-
der to stop it. It was not until 1870,
when Queen Victoria was on the throne
of Great Britain, that we finally man-
aged to have an understanding and se-
cure rights, whereby a British subject,
if he so desired, could expatriate him-
self.

With citizenship and naturalization
pretty well settled, we could expect
greater immigration of people from
other countries. It is rather interest-
ing to take a look at the various forces
that sent people here. Of course, some
of them probably came with romantic
notions as to what the new land offered;
but there were other reasons besides
that.

From 1770 to 1820, it is estimated that
perhaps not more than 250,000 people
came to this country, largely from Eu-
rope. It was estimated that in the year
1820 about 20,000 persons came to these
shores.

Then came the Irish famine, with its
hunger and misery; and it was thought
that perhaps more relief could be ob-
tained by coming to this land of free-
dom. Largely as a result of that fa-
mine—and that was in 1855—400,000
came to this country. We were not par-
ticularly immigration conscious at that
time.

Beginning in 1871, there was a need
for railroad workers, because America
was in an expansionary mood. Labor
was needed to work on the railroads that
went to the Pacific and finally closed
the frontier. In that year, we brought
in 400,000 people. But in 1878 the num-
ber dropped back to 150,000.

In 1882 came a continuance of the
Irish famine, together with the rise of
militarism in Germany. These events
accounted for the largest number of im-
migrants, and in that year 800,000 came
to this country.

In 1898, when we were still in the tail
end of the depression of 1893, which was
probably the fifth or sixth major eco-
nomic dislocation in this country, there
came, even then, 200,000 immigrants.
But a peak was reached in 1905, for in
that year 1,250,000 people came from
foreign shores.

When the depression struck after black
Friday in 1929—and, as I recall, October
19 of that year was on a Friday, so it
was not unlike the black Friday of
1873—people abroad knew full well the
difficulties that we were experiencing,
and our immigration fell to about 40,000.

The number has shuttled from that time on, generally in the area of 250,000 a year.

So we became immigration conscious, and Congress began to take note. In 1924, we heard the very first effort to develop the so-called national origins concept. In that year—and that was during the Coolidge administration—the so-called origins concept was offered on two different occasions in the House of Representatives and was defeated on both occasions. It remained for the Senate to take the initiative and to write that idea into an immigration act in that year. At first, it was felt that by using a factor of 2 percent based on the number of any given nationality in this country, as determined in the 1890 census, that would be a broad formula to determine the number that should come in from abroad. Since that time, the formula has been revised. Instead, the 1920 population census was used, and one-sixth of 1 percent has been used as the mathematical formula for determining the number of each nationality that should come to these shores.

At long last, an overall ceiling of roughly 157,000 was hit upon. It is rather strange how from that ceiling number, on a quota basis, a national origins concept was finally distributed. Eighty-two percent of that whole number came from Western and Northwestern Europe; 16 percent came from Southeastern Europe; and only 2 percent came from countries in the rest of the world.

So in 1952 we first heard about the McCarran-Walter Act.

I go back to 1933. In that year I came to Congress. After being frustrated and disappointed over committee assignments, having won in a year in which there was a presidential landslide, I thought that I should have first call on the leading committees in the House. Instead, I found myself assigned to the Committee on the District of Columbia, to the Committee of Insular Affairs, and to the Committee on Immigration. I served a great many years on the Immigration Committee on the House of Representatives.

I recall so well the individual cases and the individual bills which were introduced every year in hardship cases, and other cases which were presented to Members of Congress in every corner of the country.

In 1952 there was an overall survey of the whole problem, and out of it came the McCarran-Walter Act. It laid down the so-called national origins concept and fixed the quotas. It repealed what was sex discrimination at that time in the existing law. It repealed the Oriental Exclusion Acts that were on the books.

Every country received a quota of at least 100. Then we dealt with the so-called Asia-Pacific triangle. That is an area in the Pacific that runs roughly

from Pakistan to Japan, and then to the Polynesian Islands. Those were the intrusions on our immigration policy at that time.

One may well wonder how the McCarran-Walter Act actually worked. I believe that these figures are substantially correct, and they are yearly averages for the years from 1959 to 1963. By averages, for each of those 4 years, we received 98,000 quota immigrants. We received 180,000 nonquota immigrants.

There were an estimated 27,000 alien departures in each year. The net number of immigrants could be set at the figure of 250,000. That figure, of course, included the nonquota immigrants from this hemisphere. Generally speaking, they were divided about like this: 40,000 from Mexico, 32,000 from Canada, and 20,000 were accounted for mainly as being the wives of citizens of the United States who, as such, enjoyed a special preference.

The character of immigrants who came to our country in the period from 1952 to 1961 is, I suppose, of considerable interest, and probably will be, because of the preferential status which we have established in the pending bill.

The figures which I have show that in that 9-year period we received 8,600 who could be identified as skilled craftsmen. We received 14,000 doctors, 28,000 nurses, 12,000 technicians, 9,000 machinists, 4,900 chemists, 1,100 physicists, 30,000 engineers, and 7,000 tool and die-makers.

It has been a long time since an organized effort got underway to change the whole origins concept; and one can see the logic of it. In the first place, about 56 percent of the quota numbers were never used and, under existing law, they lapsed. They could not be transferred to another year in which all of the quota numbers had been used. That was one argument that could be well made.

Second, the smaller quotas were frightfully oversubscribed. In some cases, the number was oversubscribed by as many as 9 years. I believe that in one case it was oversubscribed to the extent of 90 years. In one case, if one were to file an application with an American consular office abroad, he could expect to wait 5 years before his application was reached; and at the other extreme, a person could expect to wait 90 years before his application would be processed.

There are still other problems and other factors. I remember cases arising out of my own experience in working on the problem of reuniting families.

A Member of this body who does not have a large metropolitan center in his State cannot quite realize how many immigration cases involving family hardship ultimately come to the attention of the Representatives and Senators; and they are tearful cases. Indeed, it would require almost the wisdom of a Solomon

to undertake to solve some of the problems.

I mentioned to our policy committee on Tuesday a case that always entranced me. The master of a freighter steamship jumped ship, his own ship, in New York, mingled with the crowd, and finally found his way to Chicago. He eventually came to my hometown. Nobody paid too much attention to him. He was a very thrifty, able, frugal worker. He got himself a dinner bucket job in a factory and, by dint of sheer diligence and devotion to his job, he finally became one of the top foremen. In a short space of time, he was being invited to come to luncheon clubs and other organizations to give speeches.

Back in those days, or at about that time, I was a district commander in the American Legion, and the Legion post in that area used to invite this man to tell about his war experiences. He had a fabulous record.

This man addressed many of the luncheon clubs. Nobody ever worried about his identity. Nobody cared whether he had a social security number. We took him into the bosom of the municipal family.

One night there was a knock on my door and there he stood. When he came into my study and told me his story, here was a man with broad shoulders, a mature man, weeping like a baby.

His problem was that his wife and youngsters were still in the old country and he wanted to get them here. He said, "I will build a new house; I can pay for it in cash. I will buy the finest furniture; I can pay for it in cash. I want my family."

Mr. President, it took me over a year, sometimes by devious effort, to work it out. However, I was there the day that that family was reunited, and what a blessed thing it really was.

That is a single instance. I do not know how many hundreds—I was going to say thousands—of times that same kind of problem came to my attention. The subject has been before Congress for many years. That was perhaps another reason for re-evaluating the concept on which we work and the concept that we followed in respect of immigration bills.

There was a question of skill. A representative of one of the largest brewing companies in this country came to me and said, "We need an alemaker. We are going into the ale business." I said, "Why don't you go and get yourself one?" He replied "It is not that easy. We found one. He is in Czechoslovakia, but how can we get him here?"

We find that often labor organizations will go before the Immigration Board and resist an application on the ground that there ought to be alemakers among our own citizens.

They were in business. They knew the product that they had to brew to sell to the American people. They knew it required a topflight alembic. It took some doing to get him here; but, Mr. President, I finally brought him over.

There we have an example of skills that we can use, that are identified in various corners of the world. But how to bring them here is quite a problem, unless we give them a preferential status.

Then there were the pressures from abroad. When, at long last, Sukarno finished with the Dutch in Indonesia, there were thousands of refugees, thousands of whom had to go back to Holland. In Holland, they have difficulty reclaiming land from the sea and holding back the sea so that it would not impregnate their soil and destroy its fertility. It is a little country. They can take care of only so many.

The Dutch Ambassador has been to see me several times, pleading, "Can't you possibly do something so that we can get 10,000 of them into this country? For us, it is a burden to sustain them." That is another problem that we deal with when we face up to immigration policies and how to do equity in every case.

It is no secret that a good many people feel that southeastern Europe is the object and the victim of discrimination. When one looks at the one-sided quotas, one can readily come to that conclusion. For, under these various enactments in other years, 82 percent of the entire quota from northwestern Europe, only 16 percent from southeastern Europe, and 2 percent from the rest of the world, one can easily see the foundation for the charge that there has been discrimination.

Then there is the fact that we have been constantly patching our immigration laws. Over here sits a former distinguished Governor from Idaho. We were discussing the problem the other night.

I remember, Governor, if I may affectionately call you that, the fuss that we had about bringing Basque shepherders to this country. I was delighted, the other night, to hear you tell the story about their frugality and assimilability into the population, and how they have graduated from sheepherding into profitable businesses in Idaho and some other Western States. They are among the best citizens there, as the Governor can so well testify. It was a job to bring them in, but it was a piece of patchwork we accomplished.

I remember the difficulty we had when we tried to patch up the law so far as orphans are concerned. Is there a heart that does not bleed for orphans? But bringing them in was quite another question. All of that had to be considered in the preparation of the bill.

Then, of course, there were the refugees. Anyone who has ever inspected refugee camps—and I have inspected them in the Levantine States like Lebanon and Syria, in Palestine, in India, and in Europe; I have seen Berlin virtually ringed with refugee camps, to the point where finally they become professional refugees.

That is not difficult to understand. When I said to the officials of Syria, "Why not issue these people work cards, so that they can go to work?" and obviously they could not without a work card. They said, "Our own labor is opposed to it." So, no work card, no work. No work, they fall back upon their refugee status. A second generation of professional refugees has not gotten out of some of the camps in various parts of the world. It is a problem that we cannot blink. In this bill, we provide for 10,200 refugees, but within the ceiling of 170,000 for all of the world except the Western Hemisphere.

I add to all this the individual relief bills that we were continually called upon to introduce. It should not have to be done. But it had to be done, and it takes time to process every one.

There are other factors that I think dictated the need for a new approach to the whole problem of immigration. There is one item in the bill that is my particular baby, and that is the Commission, three from the Senate, three from the House, and nine appointed by the President, to make a 3-year study, not only of immigration, but of the population explosion generally and its impact on employment and unemployment as well. That Commission is to make its first report on the 1st of July, 1967. That will be 1 year before the transition from our present system to the new system becomes entirely complete. The final report will be made on the 30th of June 1968, when the transition is completed.

I have given some attention to the problem; and it, too, is a problem we cannot blink. Down on Massachusetts Avenue there is a privately endowed population reference bureau which works in this field. The figures I have here, I have obtained from them. The world population will increase and is increasing now by the fantastic number of 65 million every year. Sixty-five million motels are born into this world every year at one place or another. In Latin America—and these figures are obtained from the same source—the present population is about 200 million. By 1980—and that is only 15 years away—it is estimated that the figure will be 374 million.

What will they do? They will be beating upon the doors of this country. Under a nonquota system, so long as they can satisfy consular officers that they

can sustain themselves, and that they will not become public charges, they can come into this country.

I presume, as a rounded figure, that we can say that 120,000 come in as nonquota immigrants from the Western Hemisphere every year. In the bill we have set a ceiling of 120,000.

I do not believe our Canadian neighbors will become so excited, because, insofar as I know, they would prefer to keep their people at home instead of having them migrate to the United States for residence purposes.

I doubt whether we shall have any difficulty so far as the adjoining Republic of Mexico is concerned. We get at the present time, I believe, about 40,000 from Canada and about 32,000 from Mexico.

Then there is the figure of, roughly, 20,000 spouses and perhaps children of those who are already legally in this country.

In the bill, there is a quota of 120,000 for the Western Hemisphere. The origins concept is repealed. Going back to consider how it was devised, I presume it served a purpose in its time, for want of something better. However, I am sure it is an outmoded system today, and cannot well be logically sustained.

We have repealed the so-called Asian-Pacific triangle. It is estimated that when we total up the score, there may be an additional 50,000 or 60,000 people who will come into this country over the averages that we have had before.

I puzzled about it. I have received telephone calls and letters, scolding, and resisting the idea, and urging me not to support the pending bill.

A few years back, we passed a bill which had the rather sweet title of "The Fair Share Act." In this modern world, I fancy we must make allowances for our fair share. As population crowds in other countries, we can scold, we can say, "Go down to Brazil, to that vast area." Some of it is primitive, and I have flown over most of it, but the Brazilians are likely to say, "You do your share and we will do ours."

We might then say, "Go to the Argentine. There is a great deal of space there." They are likely to say, "You do your share and we will do ours."

It is in that spirit that we must approach the pending bill today; and I believe that that idea was constantly in the minds of the members of the committee in undertaking to put the final touches on the measure. It is a workmanlike job. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] deserves generous praise for the diligence with which he has pursued this matter, the long hours and the hard work which he has devoted to it.

For a time, it appeared that perhaps we might have difficulty ever getting a

September 22, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

23877

bill. There were many differences concerning it. I remember a significant meeting in my office at which three persons were present—I shall not name them; but, I will say that after we got through we had a fair understanding, and with that understanding the bill began to move. So it is on the floor of the Senate today for consideration.

Now, Mr. President, a word about some of the opposition's argument, some of the criticism—and the appropriate answers.

It has been alleged that we shall be flooding the labor market of the country. In the first place, there is a 170,000 world ceiling, and a 120,000 Western Hemisphere ceiling. In addition, if a person wishes to come into this country only for the purpose of getting a job, he not only requires consular clearance, but also clearance by the Secretary of Labor as labor.

It has been said that we shall be opening up the gates to a vast flood from some particular country. That is the reason the pending bill contains a ceiling of 20,000 from any 1 country—no more.

It has been said that we are opening up the floodgates generally. All I can do is point to the ceilings which have been imposed and invite attention to the fact that the additions over the ceilings are based essentially upon reunification of families.

It has been said that we shall get a great number of undesirables. None of the screening process which has been carried in existing law has been forfeited in the pending bill. Applicants still have to be screened. There is still power in American consular offices in every part of the world to look a person over, to look his application over, and to determine whether he fits within the frame of the pending bill and would be a desirable addition to this free land of ours.

It has been said that we might encourage so-called ship-jumping or crew drop-offs. Of course, there is a provision in the pending bill under which bond can be required in order to hold that to a minimum.

It has been said that unless we do something about the Western Hemisphere, we may be inundated. The 120,000 ceiling is there.

I believe that we should pay tribute to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] who was the author of that ceiling and who insisted upon it—and I insisted along with him; because as our population expands I can foresee what the problem will be, not in the remote future, but in the near future.

Thus, that is a protection. I know of nothing else that we can write into the bill in order to satisfy those who might have been critical or who are opposed to

the bill; but, I have said on occasion to some Members who have not been confronted with these problems of family reunification, and skills, that if they had a metropolitan center in their State they would soon find out what it means, and the many cases which would come across their desks in the course of a year.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. In the course of the interesting colloquy just had with the Senator from Michigan, the Senator from North Carolina, and myself, it was said that we wished to make it clear—and all of us join in this—to our friends and brothers in all of the Americas, Canada, Mexico, and the other American states, that this bill represents an effort to do something globally for the immigration policy of the United States which, to many of us, has been so unsatisfactory that we are proceeding to reform this across the board. We have tried to do this within the confines of the pending bill. It represents a contribution to the totality of a great and constructive reform in American immigration policy.

The greatest solicitude has been shown in many parts of the bill, in the regularization of the status of Cuban refugees, and in other ways to show that we propose to continue this special relationship, this solidarity, with the people of all the Americas.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] was gracious enough to join in that, and I address the same suggestion to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I could point out, in addition, that since this transition does not become complete until July 1, 1968, we still have room for maneuvering. Obviously, when we provide for an arbitrary ceiling, we cannot expect everyone to like it, we cannot expect other countries and their officials, particularly, to like it; but this will be an opportunity to make a try and see what we can accomplish. In that 3-year period, we may have to make some modifications, but we will then have better figures at hand, and if modifications are required, they can be made.

Mr. JAVITS. Would the Senator from Illinois also join us—and I shall detain the Senate for only 30 seconds more—in the statement that we do not feel that Latin America has abused the unrestricted immigration privilege, that the pending bill is not the result of any such feeling, but rather the feeling of the Senator from Illinois, the Senator from North Carolina, and other Senators, as regards international policy; that we should reform our immigration policy across the board.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is it.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. The Senator pointed up the population explosion in this hemisphere with some dramatic figures.

I do not wish anything placed in the bill which would affect our relationships with our friendly neighbors in this hemisphere, but I approve of the Ervin amendment, or something along that line. I believe that it is much easier, in view of the figures the Senator has submitted, that we do something now, than that we should be forced to do something 5 years from now, and the Secretary of State and the President at that time are forced to place into law a policy which would then be really a curtailing policy, whereas this is more of a limiting policy.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct. We have in mind, of course, those who see our own population growth and who become concerned about the impact of migration from abroad on the labor market of this country. We have not been insensitive of that fact. So out of this same reference bureau—and I think I may as well put the full name in the Record; it is the Population Reference Bureau, Inc., 1755 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.—we get some very interesting figures.

Our population today is growing at the rate of 7,200 every 24 hours. If that rate continues, it will take only 700 days to accumulate a 5-million increase.

Those people are experts in their field, because they have been so bold as to forecast that in the month of May 1967, our population will reach 200 million.

So while other countries grow, our country grows, too. That is another factor to be kept in mind. We do not want to be arbitrary, but we want to meet every challenge, every consideration, every problem as we may conceive it. Who knows what modifications will have to be made in other days? If they are to be made, I am sure the Congress will be willing to make them.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I am sure Congress will do that. My point was that it is easier to do it today in the bill than, in view of the figures to which the Senator has referred, as well as other figures which are available, to do it 5 or 6 or 7 years from now. We can always modify, but it seems to me the time has come to do something today, which is not restrictive today, but which would prevent us from having to do something that might be catastrophic in the future.

We are to have a sugar bill, which is being considered by the Finance Committee, next week, if the other body should dispose of it. I have received numerous calls from those who represent

sugar interests in other countries with reference to the bill. I have had no inquiries with respect to the Ervin proposal. Perhaps there could be a difference of 10,000 or 20,000 in the figure, but if the good Lord and the people of Kentucky permit me to be in this body, say, 10 years from now, and there were a need to place restrictions in immigration at that time, I am sure we would have many calls.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The point the Senator makes is so proximate to the problem before us now. Representatives of a country from South Africa were in my office only 2 weeks ago. I said, "You are far away from home. Why are you interested in getting a bigger share of the sugar quota?" I was told, "For the reason that we have heavy unemployment, and we think an expansion of our quota is the only thing we can do to provide some jobs to relieve the growth pressure." So the question before us is a fabric of many dimensions.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. With respect to the discussion about hemispheric restrictions, which was referred to in the dialog between the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Kentucky, the provisions which were considered in the House did provide some restrictions on the Western Hemisphere. The House bill which was considered and acted upon provided a sort of sliding ceiling, so that in any one year the number coming from the Western Hemisphere could not exceed the mean of the preceding 5 years by 10 percent without causing the President to report to Congress.

The labor provisions were also tightened with relation to those who sought to come into this country and enter the labor ranks.

For the RECORD, those of us who had serious reservations in accepting the restriction of 120,000, exclusive of immediate family relationships, felt that the provisions included in the House bill were sufficiently restrictive to take into consideration the growth of population in the Latin American countries or any other factors related to hemispheric immigration.

I wanted the RECORD to be clear, at this point in the dialog, for the benefit of Senators who may still have reservations about the ceilings, that we are on firm ground and we do not believe this measure will open unlimited immigration to this country from the Western Hemisphere or anywhere else.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield on that point, I did not mean to imply that what was done was absolutely correct or proper. I, too, have reservations about the way we are approaching the problem. I am not un-

sympathetic toward the position the Senator has expressed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator has rather consistently on all occasions embraced the idea he has just expressed. Others of us like myself felt that there ought to be an unequivocal provision in the law, and it ought to be an ascertained figure. I like that approach infinitely better, and that is why I joined the Senator from North Carolina with respect to the provision he wanted to have inserted in the bill. I think it is a good ceiling and that we should try it. We are flexible enough to be able to deal with it in the days ahead.

Mr. President, in connection with my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a rather interesting publication of the Population Reference Bureau called "Population Profile."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POPULATION PROFILE

In 165 years the daily U.S. population increase has grown 16 times: About 1800, daily increase 450; mid-1965 daily increase 7,200.

ONE HUNDRED AND NINETY-FIVE MILLION AMERICANS

Anyone contemplating a big celebration for the day when the U.S. population reaches 200 million should start planning fairly soon. According to the Population Reference Bureau, there are only about 21 months to go.

The 195-million mark is expected to be reached in late August of this year. At the present rate of growth the next 5 million needed to top 200 million would be added around May 1967.

Currently, U.S. population is growing by about 7,200 a day, requiring some 700 days to accumulate a 5-million increase. The first U.S. Census in 1790 enumerated 3.9 million persons. For two decades thereafter the Nation's growth averaged only about 450 persons a day, requiring 30 years to add 5 million. The U.S. birth rate around 1790 was more than twice as high as it is now. However, today's larger population base of 195 million can roll up a 5-million increase much faster than a base of 3.9 million.

BIGGER, NOT BETTER

Once a country's population passes the 100-million mark, even a moderate fertility rate produces a sizable numerical increase. India's population, for example, is increasing by 5 million every 150 days. If India suddenly cut both her birth rate and death rate in half, making them roughly equal to the U.S. rates (21.2 births and 9.4 deaths per 1,000 population), her population would still increase at well over 5 million a year. This is what comes of having a population of nearly half a billion. If population growth in the United States continues at the present rate, in just over 60 years this Nation will have as many people as India has today.

Japan, to take another example, has cut her birth rate to among the lowest in the world, 17.2. With a population just under 100 million, Japan will still realize a 5-million increase in 5½ years. In Canada, on the other hand, where the population is less than 20 million, it would take over 10 years at the current rate of growth to reach a total of 25 million.

MORE PEOPLE, LOWER BIRTH RATE

Around 1800, when the U.S. birth rate was over 50, the annual population increase was about 165,000. Today, with a moderate birth rate of 21.2, the increase is over 2.8 million each year.

The uncertainty of the family-size preferences of upcoming parents makes the future of U.S. population growth difficult to predict. During the post-World War II baby boom, the U.S. birth rate reached 26.6 in 1947—the highest since 1921. Although the rate has declined somewhat in recent years, the population gain for the intercensal decade (1950-60) was an unprecedented 28 million—almost identical to the 28.5-million increase for the 20-year period, 1930-50.

While the U.S. birth rate has gone down since 1957 and shows no signs of leveling off, the rising tide of young women just entering the high-fertility age group, 20 to 29, is expected to make an impression on the total fertility of the Nation.

"The 195-million mark in August may become a turning point in U.S. population growth," according to Robert C. Cook, president of the Population Reference Bureau.

In view of the very large fertility potential which now confronts us, the decades immediately ahead must be viewed as crucial ones," said Cook. "Even with a leveling off of the birth rate, we will be adding nearly 3 million a year to our population. If present trends continue, we will reach a growth level of 5 million a year during the last decades of the century." The highest projection of the Bureau of the Census, based on a return to the high-fertility rates of the postwar years, shows the U.S. population increasing by 7.5 million per year between 2000 and 2010.

SHIFTING AGE STRUCTURE

At present, American parents of a newborn baby can expect their child to live past the age of 70. In 1900, life expectancy at birth was less than 50 years. The U.S. population aged 65 and over has increased by almost 500 percent since 1900, from 3 million to nearly 18 million. The number of children under 19 has risen from 34 million in 1900 to 77 million today.

The median age of the population is now 28.5 years and could drop to 25 years if U.S. fertility reverts to the postwar pattern. Thus, over half the population is in the dependent age groups of under 19 and over 65.

"Urban concentration is adding to the problems created by this socially demanding age structure," Cook said. "Over 70 percent of all Americans live in cities. Already we are nationally distraught by the perplexing problems of urban congestion, water shortage, juvenile crime, chronic deficiency in educational facilities, and inadequate care of the aged.

"Those who think growth to 195 million Americans should be celebrated with noisemakers and paper hats might well prepare their children to celebrate the 400-million mark with padlocked personal water bottles and oxygen masks."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a table giving a summary of immigrant and nonimmigrant visas issued for the fiscal year 1964.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—Summary of immigrant and nonimmigrant visas issued, fiscal year 1964

[Nonimmigrant visas by country of nationality; quota immigrant visas by country or area of quota or subquota chargeability; nonquota visas by country or area of birth or presumed quota chargeability]

| Country | Annual quota | Immigrant visas | | | | Nonimmigrant visas | | | Total, immigrant and non-immigrant |
|---|--------------|-----------------|----------|---------------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|
| | | Quota | Nonquota | Special nonquota symbol K | Total, immigrant | Issued | Re-validated | Total, non-immigrant | |
| Europe: | | | | | | | | | |
| Albania..... | 100 | 95 | 6 | 1 | 102 | 17 | | 17 | 119 |
| Andorra..... | 100 | | | | | 2 | | 2 | 2 |
| Austria..... | 1,405 | 1,299 | 265 | 2 | 1,566 | 7,630 | 883 | 8,513 | 10,079 |
| Belgium..... | 1,297 | 981 | 54 | 2 | 1,037 | 8,499 | 755 | 9,254 | 10,301 |
| Bulgaria..... | 100 | 86 | 26 | | 112 | 300 | 7 | 307 | 419 |
| Czechoslovakia..... | 2,859 | 1,875 | 87 | 31 | 1,994 | 2,363 | 55 | 2,418 | 4,412 |
| Danzig, Free City of..... | 100 | 92 | 34 | | 126 | | | | 126 |
| Denmark: | | | | | | | | | |
| Government country..... | | 1,147 | 224 | | 1,371 | 8,225 | 1,022 | 9,247 | 10,618 |
| Greenland..... | | | | | | | | | |
| Denmark, total..... | 1,175 | 1,147 | 224 | | 1,371 | 8,225 | 1,022 | 9,247 | 10,618 |
| Estonia..... | 115 | 102 | 12 | | 114 | 2 | 85 | 147 | 261 |
| Finland..... | 566 | 536 | 105 | | 641 | 4,487 | 309 | 4,796 | 5,437 |
| France: | | | | | | | | | |
| Governing country..... | | 2,713 | 1,471 | 5 | 4,189 | 42,821 | 3,771 | 36,592 | 50,781 |
| Algeria..... | | 2 | 3 | | 5 | | | | 5 |
| French Guiana..... | | 2 | | | 3 | | | | 3 |
| Guadeloupe..... | | 98 | 1 | | 99 | | | | 99 |
| Martinique..... | | 46 | | | 46 | | | | 46 |
| Reunion..... | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 1 |
| Comoro Islands..... | | 2 | 4 | | 6 | | | | 6 |
| French Polynesia..... | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 1 |
| French Somaliland..... | | | | | | | | | |
| French Southern Island..... | | 4 | | | 4 | | | | 4 |
| New Caledonia..... | | | | | | | | | |
| St. Pierre and Miquelon..... | | | | | | | | | |
| New Hebrides..... | | | | | | | | | |
| France, total..... | 3,069 | 2,870 | 1,479 | 5 | 4,354 | 42,821 | 3,771 | 46,592 | 50,946 |
| Germany..... | 25,814 | 23,751 | 4,932 | 8 | 28,691 | 59,459 | 7,646 | 77,105 | 105,795 |
| Great Britain Northern Ireland: | | | | | | | | | |
| Governing country..... | | 29,444 | 865 | 15 | 30,324 | 131,628 | 10,797 | 142,425 | 172,749 |
| Aden..... | | 31 | | | 31 | | | | 31 |
| Antigua..... | | 100 | 68 | 4 | 172 | | | | 172 |
| Bahamas..... | | 100 | 128 | 2 | 230 | | | | 230 |
| Barbados..... | | 100 | 259 | 13 | 372 | | | | 372 |
| Basutoland..... | | | | | | | | | |
| Bechuanaland..... | | 100 | 5 | | 105 | | | | 105 |
| Bermuda..... | | 67 | 60 | 28 | 155 | | | | 155 |
| British Guiana..... | | 61 | 81 | 3 | 145 | | | | 145 |
| British Honduras..... | | | | | | | | | |
| British Solomon Islands..... | | 100 | 51 | 1 | 152 | | | | 152 |
| British Virgin Islands..... | | | | | | | | | |
| Brunei..... | | 100 | 20 | 5 | 125 | | | | 125 |
| Cayman Island..... | | 99 | 3 | | 102 | | | | 102 |
| Dominica..... | | 1 | 1 | | 2 | | | | 2 |
| Falkland Islands..... | | 4 | 6 | | 10 | | | | 10 |
| Fiji..... | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 1 |
| Gambia..... | | 17 | | | 17 | | | | 17 |
| Gibraltar..... | | | | | | | | | |
| Gilbert Islands..... | | 100 | 36 | | 136 | | | | 136 |
| Grenada..... | | 99 | 9 | | 108 | | | | 108 |
| Hong Kong..... | | 25 | 2 | | 27 | | | | 27 |
| Korea..... | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 1 |
| Maldives Islands..... | | 98 | 125 | 8 | 231 | | | | 231 |
| Malta..... | | 14 | 2 | | 16 | | | | 16 |
| Mauritius..... | | 99 | 9 | | 108 | | | | 108 |
| Montserrat..... | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 1 |
| North Borneo..... | | 55 | | | 55 | | | | 55 |
| North Rhodesia..... | | 4 | 2 | | 6 | | | | 6 |
| Nyasaland..... | | | | | | | | | |
| Pitcairn Island..... | | 100 | 56 | | 156 | | | | 156 |
| St. Christopher-Nevis..... | | 2 | | | 2 | | | | 2 |
| St. Helena..... | | 100 | 8 | | 108 | | | | 108 |
| St. Lucia..... | | 100 | 23 | | 123 | | | | 123 |
| St. Vincent..... | | | | | | | | | |
| Sarawak..... | | 3 | 1 | | 4 | | | | 4 |
| Seychelles..... | | 18 | 3 | | 21 | | | | 21 |
| Singapore..... | | 94 | 9 | | 103 | | | | 103 |
| Southern Rhodesia..... | | | | | | | | | |
| Swaziland..... | | 2 | | | 2 | | | | 2 |
| Tonga..... | | 20 | 2 | 3 | 25 | | | | 25 |
| Turks Island..... | | 2 | | | 2 | | | | 2 |
| Uganda..... | | 3 | | | 3 | | | | 3 |
| Zanzibar..... | | | | | | | | | |
| Great Britain and North Ireland, total..... | 65,361 | 31,205 | 1,833 | 82 | 33,180 | 131,628 | 10,797 | 142,425 | 175,605 |
| Greece..... | 308 | 224 | 1,858 | 320 | 2,402 | 9,601 | 1,183 | 10,844 | 13,246 |
| Hungary..... | 865 | 711 | 228 | 55 | 995 | 4,746 | 314 | 5,060 | 6,055 |
| Iceland..... | 100 | 85 | 77 | | 162 | 827 | 108 | 935 | 1,097 |
| Ireland..... | 17,756 | 6,256 | 72 | | 6,328 | 7,973 | 334 | 8,307 | 14,635 |
| Italy..... | 5,668 | 5,390 | 4,217 | 1,612 | 11,219 | 37,290 | 5,085 | 43,384 | 54,603 |
| Latvia..... | 235 | 215 | 32 | 5 | 252 | 36 | 48 | 84 | 336 |
| Liechtenstein..... | 100 | 11 | | | 11 | 20 | | 20 | 31 |
| Lithuania..... | 834 | 343 | 44 | 5 | 392 | 48 | 24 | 72 | 464 |
| Luxembourg..... | 100 | 87 | 0 | | 93 | 462 | 25 | 477 | 570 |
| Monaco..... | 100 | 10 | 1 | | 11 | 14 | 4 | 18 | 29 |
| Netherlands: | | | | | | | | | |
| Governing country..... | | 2,830 | 313 | | 3,149 | 21,834 | 3,610 | 25,444 | 28,593 |
| Netherlands, New Guinea..... | | | | | | | | | |
| Netherlands Antilles..... | | 99 | 56 | 1 | 156 | | | | 156 |
| Surinam..... | | 81 | 10 | | 91 | | | | 91 |
| Netherlands, total..... | 3,136 | 3,016 | 379 | 1 | 3,390 | 21,834 | 3,610 | 25,444 | 28,840 |
| Norway..... | 2,364 | 2,170 | 53 | | 2,223 | 10,985 | 590 | 11,575 | 13,798 |
| Poland..... | 6,488 | 6,170 | 1,008 | 57 | 7,235 | 3,230 | 118 | 3,348 | 10,583 |

23880

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 22, 1965

TABLE 1.—Summary of immigrant and nonimmigrant visas issued, fiscal year 1964—Continued

[Nonimmigrant visas by country of nationality; quota immigrant visas by country or area of quota or subquota chargeability; nonquota visas by country or area of birth or presumed quota chargeability]

| Country | Annual quota | Immigrant visas | | | | Nonimmigrant visas | | | Total, immigrant and non- immigrant |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|----------|---------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|------------------|--------------------------|--|
| | | Quota | Nonquota | Special nonquota symbol K | Total, immigrant | Issued | Re- validated | Total, non- immigrant | |
| Europe—Continued | | | | | | | | | |
| Portugal: | | | | | | | | | |
| Governing country..... | | 373 | 1,025 | 317 | 1,715 | 4,814 | 552 | 5,366 | 7,081 |
| Angola..... | | 1 | 1 | | 2 | | | | 2 |
| Cape Verde Islands..... | | 19 | 23 | | 42 | | | | 42 |
| Guinea, Portuguese..... | | | | | | | | | |
| India, Portuguese..... | | 1 | | | 1 | | | | 1 |
| Macao..... | | 1 | 1 | | 2 | | | | 2 |
| Mozambique..... | | 1 | 1 | | 2 | | | | 2 |
| Principe and Sao Tome..... | | 1 | 1 | | 2 | | | | 2 |
| Timor..... | | | | | | | | | |
| Portugal, total..... | 438 | 396 | 1,051 | 417 | 1,764 | 4,814 | 552 | 5,366 | 7,130 |
| Rumania..... | 289 | 200 | 130 | 71 | 407 | 641 | 16 | 657 | 1,064 |
| San Marino..... | 100 | 100 | 6 | | 106 | 23 | | 23 | 129 |
| Spain: | | | | | | | | | |
| Governing country..... | | 159 | 1,469 | 72 | 1,700 | 12,565 | 1,670 | 14,235 | 15,935 |
| Fernando Po..... | | | | | | | | | |
| Idri..... | | | | | | | | | |
| Rio Muni..... | | | | | | | | | |
| Spanish Sahara..... | | | | | | | | | |
| Spain, total..... | 250 | 159 | 1,469 | 72 | 1,700 | 12,565 | 1,670 | 14,235 | 15,935 |
| Sweden..... | 3,295 | 2,165 | 72 | | 2,237 | 14,676 | 897 | 15,472 | 17,709 |
| Switzerland..... | 1,698 | 1,610 | 128 | 1 | 1,739 | 12,444 | 927 | 13,371 | 15,110 |
| Union of Soviet Socialist Republics..... | 2,697 | 2,590 | 102 | 11 | 2,703 | 1,906 | 17 | 1,923 | 4,626 |
| Yugoslavia..... | 942 | 724 | 343 | 36 | 1,108 | 2,945 | 379 | 8,324 | 4,432 |
| Europe, total..... | 149,372 | 96,732 | 20,344 | 2,695 | 119,771 | 422,531 | 42,241 | 464,772 | 584,543 |
| Asia: | | | | | | | | | |
| Afghanistan..... | 100 | 29 | | | 29 | 289 | 7 | 296 | 325 |
| Arab Peninsula..... | 100 | 15 | 1 | | 16 | 82 | 1 | 83 | 99 |
| Asia Pacific..... | 100 | 89 | 575 | | 661 | | | | 661 |
| Bhutan..... | 100 | | | | | | | | |
| Burma..... | 100 | 85 | 5 | | 91 | 205 | 21 | 226 | 317 |
| Cambodia..... | 100 | 3 | 5 | | 8 | 170 | 12 | 182 | 190 |
| Ceylon..... | 100 | 87 | 10 | | 97 | 329 | 45 | 374 | 471 |
| China..... | 100 | 79 | 170 | 23 | 272 | 8,225 | 594 | 8,819 | 9,091 |
| Chinese persons..... | 105 | | 2,177 | 197 | 2,374 | | | | 2,374 |
| Cyprus..... | 100 | 88 | 50 | 4 | 142 | 268 | 9 | 277 | 419 |
| India..... | 100 | 51 | 102 | 41 | 194 | 9,703 | 1,728 | 11,431 | 11,625 |
| Indonesia..... | 130 | 127 | 71 | 19 | 217 | 2,382 | 156 | 2,538 | 2,755 |
| Iran..... | 100 | 46 | 83 | 32 | 161 | 5,846 | 460 | 6,306 | 6,467 |
| Iraq..... | 100 | 44 | 55 | 53 | 152 | 1,338 | 208 | 1,546 | 1,698 |
| Israel..... | 100 | 42 | 142 | 23 | 207 | 14,848 | 870 | 15,718 | 15,925 |
| Japan..... | 185 | 101 | 3,159 | 65 | 3,325 | 39,299 | 891 | 40,190 | 43,515 |
| Jordan..... | 100 | 87 | 195 | 55 | 337 | 873 | 20 | 893 | 1,230 |
| Korea..... | 100 | 37 | 2,166 | 44 | 2,247 | 4,660 | 236 | 4,896 | 7,143 |
| Kuwait..... | 100 | 6 | | | 6 | 247 | 21 | 268 | 274 |
| Laos..... | 100 | 7 | | | 7 | 224 | | 224 | 231 |
| Lebanon..... | 100 | 56 | 135 | 20 | 211 | 2,740 | 915 | 3,655 | 3,866 |
| Malaya..... | 50 | 15 | 3 | | 18 | 302 | 6 | 308 | 326 |
| Malaysia..... | 200 | 29 | 18 | | 47 | 675 | 19 | 694 | 741 |
| Muscat and Oman..... | 100 | | | | | 3 | 4 | 7 | 11 |
| Nepal..... | 100 | 3 | | | 3 | 122 | 13 | 135 | 138 |
| Pakistan..... | 100 | 45 | 26 | 8 | 79 | 2,830 | 69 | 2,899 | 2,978 |
| Palestine..... | 100 | 71 | 32 | | 103 | 14 | 4 | 18 | 121 |
| Philippines..... | 100 | 36 | 2,378 | 193 | 2,607 | 12,828 | 2,140 | 14,968 | 17,575 |
| Saudi Arabia..... | 100 | 9 | 1 | | 10 | 754 | 22 | 776 | 796 |
| Syria..... | 100 | 69 | 49 | 3 | 121 | 865 | 126 | 991 | 1,112 |
| Thailand..... | 100 | 85 | 54 | | 139 | 2,408 | 19 | 2,427 | 2,626 |
| Turkey..... | 225 | 87 | 159 | 184 | 430 | 2,843 | 249 | 3,092 | 3,522 |
| Vietnam..... | 100 | 47 | 143 | | 192 | 2,192 | 34 | 2,226 | 2,416 |
| Yemen..... | 100 | 92 | 2 | | 94 | 33 | 4 | 37 | 131 |
| Asia, total..... | 3,715 | 1,665 | 11,966 | 964 | 14,595 | 117,657 | 8,900 | 126,557 | 141,152 |
| Africa: | | | | | | | | | |
| Algeria..... | 287 | 78 | 8 | | 86 | 76 | | 76 | 162 |
| Burundi..... | 100 | | | | | | | | |
| Cameroon..... | 161 | 2 | | | 2 | 122 | 8 | 130 | 132 |
| Central African Republic..... | 100 | | | | | 18 | 3 | 21 | 21 |
| Chad..... | 100 | | | | | 28 | 2 | 30 | 30 |
| Congo..... | 100 | 1 | | | 1 | 37 | | 37 | 38 |
| Congo, Republic of the..... | 100 | 28 | 2 | | 30 | 253 | 21 | 274 | 304 |
| Dahomey..... | 100 | | | | | 61 | 4 | 65 | 65 |
| Ethiopia..... | 100 | 78 | 3 | | 81 | 480 | 49 | 529 | 610 |
| Gabon..... | 100 | | | | | 39 | 38 | 77 | 77 |
| Ghana..... | 100 | 58 | 4 | | 62 | 478 | 57 | 535 | 597 |
| Guinea..... | 100 | | 1 | | 1 | 188 | 13 | 196 | 197 |
| Ivory Coast..... | 100 | 2 | | | 2 | 100 | | 100 | 102 |
| Kenya..... | 20 | 10 | 1 | | 11 | 814 | 23 | 837 | 848 |
| Liberia..... | 100 | 39 | 3 | | 42 | 482 | 63 | 545 | 587 |
| Libya..... | 100 | 93 | 16 | | 109 | 217 | 5 | 222 | 331 |
| Malagasy Republic..... | 100 | 4 | 1 | | 5 | 103 | 8 | 106 | 111 |
| Mali..... | 100 | | | | | 63 | 2 | 65 | 65 |
| Mauritania..... | 100 | | | | | 34 | | 34 | 34 |
| Morocco..... | 100 | 66 | 113 | 2 | 181 | 714 | 47 | 761 | 942 |
| Niger..... | 100 | 1 | | | 1 | 62 | 13 | 75 | 76 |
| Nigeria..... | 149 | 85 | | | 85 | 3,120 | 83 | 3,203 | 3,288 |
| Rwanda..... | 100 | | | | | 15 | 1 | 16 | 16 |
| Senegal..... | 100 | 6 | | | 6 | 97 | 7 | 104 | 110 |
| Sierra Leone..... | 100 | 13 | 1 | | 14 | 305 | 35 | 340 | 354 |
| Somali Republic..... | 100 | 4 | 1 | | 5 | 104 | 11 | 115 | 120 |
| South Africa..... | 100 | 57 | 69 | | 126 | 4,438 | 653 | 4,991 | 5,117 |
| South-West Africa..... | 100 | 9 | 21 | 5 | 35 | 15 | 11 | 26 | 61 |
| Sudan..... | 100 | 75 | 1 | | 76 | 817 | 22 | 839 | 425 |

September 22, 1965

TABLE 1.—Summary of immigrant and nonimmigrant visas issued, fiscal year 1964—Continued

[Nonimmigrant visas by country of nationality; quota immigrant visas by country or area of quota or subquota chargeability; nonquota visas by country or area of birth or presumed quota chargeability]

| Country | Annual quota | Immigrant visas | | | | Nonimmigrant visas | | | Total, immigrant and non-immigrant |
|-----------------------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|---------------------------|------------------|--------------------|----------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|
| | | Quota | Nonquota | Special nonquota symbol K | Total, immigrant | Issued | Re-validated | Total, non-immigrant | |
| Africa—Continued | | | | | | | | | |
| Tanganyika | 100 | 40 | | | 40 | 233 | 2 | 235 | 275 |
| Togo | 100 | 1 | | | 1 | 75 | 8 | 83 | 84 |
| Tunisia | 100 | 90 | 14 | 3 | 107 | 285 | 14 | 299 | 406 |
| Uganda | 50 | 4 | | | 4 | 109 | 5 | 114 | 118 |
| United Arab Republic | 100 | 47 | 74 | 22 | 143 | 2,393 | 636 | 3,029 | 3,172 |
| Upper Volta | 100 | | | | | 24 | 2 | 26 | 26 |
| Africa, total | 3,657 | 891 | 333 | 32 | 1,256 | 15,386 | 1,741 | 17,127 | 18,383 |
| North America: | | | | | | | | | |
| Canada | | | 33,604 | | 33,604 | 747 | 69 | 816 | 39,420 |
| Costa Rica | | | 2,690 | | 2,690 | 4,574 | 115 | 4,689 | 7,379 |
| Cuba | | | 16,088 | | 16,088 | 2,033 | 545 | 2,578 | 18,666 |
| Dominican Republic | | | 7,206 | | 7,206 | 23,828 | 2,118 | 25,946 | 33,152 |
| El Salvador | | | 1,345 | | 1,345 | 4,524 | 115 | 4,639 | 5,984 |
| Guatemala | | | 619 | | 619 | 5,817 | 1,744 | 7,561 | 8,180 |
| Haiti | | | 2,155 | | 2,155 | 3,652 | 500 | 4,062 | 6,217 |
| Honduras | | | 1,815 | | 1,815 | 3,652 | 238 | 3,890 | 5,705 |
| Jamaica | 100 | 90 | 1,393 | 153 | 1,636 | 13,459 | 653 | 14,112 | 15,778 |
| Mexico | | | 31,324 | | 31,324 | 124,436 | 32,392 | 206,828 | 238,152 |
| Nicaragua | | | 1,100 | | 1,100 | 3,674 | 412 | 4,086 | 5,186 |
| Panama | 100 | 100 | 1,835 | | 1,935 | 3,226 | 480 | 3,706 | 5,541 |
| Trinidad and Tobago | | | 283 | 20 | 303 | 4,925 | 528 | 5,453 | 5,812 |
| North America, total | 200 | 190 | 108,412 | 173 | 106,775 | 198,458 | 89,909 | 288,397 | 395,172 |
| South America: | | | | | | | | | |
| Argentina | | | 6,404 | | 6,404 | 16,904 | 558 | 17,462 | 23,866 |
| Bolivia | | | 780 | | 780 | 1,837 | 98 | 1,935 | 2,715 |
| Brazil | | | 2,276 | | 2,276 | 13,443 | 1,598 | 15,041 | 17,317 |
| Chile | | | 1,231 | | 1,231 | 6,375 | 418 | 6,793 | 8,024 |
| Colombia | | | 10,090 | | 10,090 | 21,053 | 1,610 | 22,663 | 32,753 |
| Ecuador | | | 3,600 | | 3,600 | 6,234 | 349 | 6,583 | 9,008 |
| Paraguay | | | 203 | | 203 | 639 | 67 | 706 | 1,416 |
| Peru | | | 2,195 | | 2,195 | 10,841 | 1,580 | 12,421 | 14,616 |
| Uruguay | | | 316 | | 316 | 2,416 | 111 | 2,527 | 2,843 |
| Venezuela | | | 897 | | 897 | 20,095 | 9,074 | 29,169 | 30,665 |
| South America, total | | | 27,992 | | 27,992 | 99,837 | 18,063 | 115,900 | 143,892 |
| Oceania: | | | | | | | | | |
| Australia: | | | | | | | | | |
| Governing country | | 51 | 228 | 4 | 283 | 19,523 | 1,623 | 21,145 | 21,429 |
| Christmas Island | | | | | | | | | |
| Cocos Island | | | | | | | | | |
| Papua, Territory of | | | | | | | | | |
| Australia, total | 100 | 51 | 228 | 4 | 283 | 19,523 | 1,623 | 21,145 | 21,429 |
| New Guinea | 100 | | | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 |
| New Zealand: | | | | | | | | | |
| Governing country | | 76 | 117 | | 193 | 6,600 | 386 | 6,986 | 7,179 |
| Cook Islands | | | | | | | | | |
| New Zealand, total | 100 | 76 | 117 | | 193 | 6,600 | 386 | 6,986 | 7,179 |
| Pacific Islands | 100 | 69 | 42 | | 111 | 242 | | 242 | 353 |
| Western Samoa | 100 | 53 | 1 | | 54 | 194 | 3 | 197 | 251 |
| Nauru | 100 | | | | | | | | |
| Oceania, total | 600 | 249 | 388 | 4 | 641 | 26,560 | 2,012 | 28,572 | 29,213 |
| No nationality | | | | | | 4,194 | 1,108 | 5,302 | 5,302 |
| Grand total | 157,544 | 99,727 | 167,435 | 3,863 | 271,030 | 884,653 | 161,974 | 1,046,627 | 1,317,657 |

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, those are the latest data I have seen on that subject.

Finally, Mr. President, from the same

No. 175—16

source, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table entitled "Population Information for 129 Countries," broken down to show

increases, decreases, and so forth. There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

September 22, 1965

World population data sheet 1—Population information for 129 countries

| Continent and country | Population estimates mid-1964 (millions) | Annual rate of increase since 1958 (percent) | Birth rate per 1,000 population (latest ²) | Death rate per 1,000 population (latest ²) | Population projections 1980 (millions ³) | Continent and country | Population estimates mid-1964 (millions) | Annual rate of increase since 1958 (percent) | Birth rate per 1,000 population (latest ²) | Death rate per 1,000 population (latest ²) | Population projections 1980 (millions ³) |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Africa: | | | | | | Asia—Continued | | | | | |
| Northern Africa: | | | (45) | (22) | | East Asia: | | | (42) | (19) | |
| Algeria | 12.0 | 2.1 | 45-49 | | 19.5 | China (mainland) | 690.0 | 2.1 | | | 840.0 |
| Ethiopia | 21.0 | | | | 29.0 | China (Taiwan) | 12.1 | 3.6 | 36.3 | 8.1 | 17.2 |
| Libya | 1.3 | 1.9 | | | 1.9 | Hong Kong ⁴ | 3.8 | 4.5 | 32.1 | 5.5 | 5.5 |
| Morocco | 13.1 | 3.0 | | | 22.4 | Japan | 96.8 | .9 | 17.2 | 7.0 | 111.1 |
| Somalia | 2.3 | | | | 2.9 | Korea, North | 10.7 | | | | 15.4 |
| Sudan | 13.2 | 2.8 | 50-56 | | 19.3 | Korea, South | 28.0 | 3.3 | 39-43 | 11-13 | 43.4 |
| Tunisia | 4.7 | 1.4 | 45-49 | 25-27 | 6.5 | Mongolia | 1.1 | 3.1 | | | 1.7 |
| United Arab Republic (Egypt) | 28.7 | 2.6 | 40-44 | 22-24 | 46.8 | America: | | | | | |
| Tropical and southern Africa: | | | | | | Northern America: | | | | | |
| Angola ⁵ | 5.1 | 2.1 | (47) | (24) | 6.0 | Canada | 19.3 | 2.1 | 24.8 | 7.8 | 26.3 |
| Burundi | 2.7 | | | | 4.2 | United States | 182.1 | 1.6 | 21.6 | 9.6 | 240.9 |
| Cameroon | 4.6 | 1.9 | 36-44 | 24-30 | 5.4 | Middle America: | | | | | |
| Central African Republic | 1.3 | 1.9 | 39-47 | 28-32 | 1.6 | Costa Rica | 1.4 | 4.3 | 49.9 | 8.5 | 2.4 |
| Chad | 2.8 | 1.1 | 44-52 | 25-31 | 3.8 | Cuba | 7.3 | 2.0 | 30-34 | 9-13 | 10.0 |
| Congo (Brazzaville) | .9 | 1.3 | | | 1.1 | Dominican Republic | 3.5 | 3.6 | 48-54 | 16-20 | 6.2 |
| Congo (Leopoldville) | 15.4 | 2.4 | 40-46 | | 21.5 | El Salvador | 2.8 | 3.6 | 48.6 | 10.8 | 4.6 |
| Dahomey | 2.3 | 2.3 | 45-53 | 20-26 | 3.0 | Guatemala | 4.2 | 3.2 | 47.7 | 17.3 | 6.9 |
| Gabon | .5 | 2.1 | | | .5 | Haiti | 4.5 | 2.2 | | | 6.9 |
| Ghana | 7.5 | 2.7 | 48-54 | | 12.3 | Honduras | 2.1 | 3.0 | 45-50 | 15-20 | 3.7 |
| Guinea | 3.5 | 3.0 | 53-57 | 33-35 | 5.0 | Jamaica | 1.7 | 1.5 | 39.6 | 9.1 | 2.1 |
| Ivory Coast | 3.7 | 2.2 | 49-55 | 33-37 | 5.0 | Mexico | 39.6 | 3.1 | 45.0 | 10.4 | 70.6 |
| Kenya | 9.1 | 2.9 | 46-54 | | 13.6 | Nicaragua | 1.6 | 3.5 | 45-52 | 12-17 | 2.8 |
| Liberia | 1.0 | | | | 1.2 | Panama | 1.2 | 3.3 | 40.1 | | 2.0 |
| Madagascar | 6.1 | 2.8 | 43-49 | 17-21 | 7.6 | Puerto Rico ⁴ | 2.6 | 1.7 | 30.9 | 6.9 | 3.1 |
| Malawi ⁶ | 3.8 | 2.1 | | | 6.1 | Trinidad and Tobago | .9 | 3.2 | 35.6 | 7.3 | 1.5 |
| Mali | 4.5 | 2.1 | 55-63 | 26-32 | 6.4 | South America: | | | | | |
| Mauritania | 1.0 | | | | 1.1 | Argentina | 21.7 | 1.6 | 21.8 | 7.9 | 29.0 |
| Mauritius ⁴ | 4.5 | 3.1 | 39.9 | 9.7 | 91.0 | Bolivia | 3.7 | 1.5 | 41-45 | 20-25 | 6.0 |
| Mozambique ⁴ | 7.2 | 2.0 | | | 4.5 | Brazil | 79.8 | 3.0 | 43-47 | 11-16 | 123.7 |
| Niger | 6.9 | 3.0 | 49-57 | 24-30 | 91.0 | British Guiana ⁴ | 0.6 | | 42.3 | 7.9 | 1.0 |
| Nigeria | 56.0 | 2.6 | 45-53 | | 3.5 | Chile | 8.4 | 2.4 | 34.2 | 11.8 | 12.4 |
| Rwanda | 2.9 | 2.7 | 39-47 | 28-29 | 3.7 | Colombia | 15.4 | 2.2 | 43-46 | 14-17 | 27.7 |
| Senegal | 3.5 | 2.7 | | | 4.4 | Ecuador | 4.8 | 3.2 | 45-50 | 15-20 | 8.0 |
| Sierra Leone | 2.2 | | | | 7.1 | Paraguay | 1.9 | 2.4 | 45-50 | 12-16 | 3.0 |
| South Africa | 17.5 | 2.6 | | | 14.4 | Pern | 11.9 | 3.0 | 42-48 | 13-18 | 17.5 |
| Southern Rhodesia ⁴ | 4.1 | 3.3 | | | 2.3 | Uruguay | 2.6 | | 21-25 | 7-9 | 3.1 |
| Tanzania ⁴ | 10.3 | 1.9 | 46-50 | | 6.3 | Venezuela | 8.4 | 3.4 | 45-50 | 10-15 | 14.9 |
| Togo | 1.6 | 2.6 | 51-59 | 26-32 | 5.7 | Europe: | | | | | |
| Uganda | 7.2 | 2.5 | 46-50 | | 7 | Northern and Western Europe: | | | | | |
| Upper Volta | 4.8 | 3.3 | 43-49 | 27-31 | 3.1 | Belgium | 9.3 | .5 | 17.2 | 12.7 | 10.1 |
| Zambia ⁷ | 3.6 | 2.8 | | | 3.1 | Denmark | 4.7 | .8 | 17.7 | 9.9 | 5.2 |
| Asia: | | | | | | Finland | 4.6 | .8 | 18.1 | 9.3 | 5.3 |
| Southwest Asia: | | | (47) | (24) | | France | 48.4 | 1.2 | 18.2 | 11.7 | 53.3 |
| Cyprus | .6 | 1.0 | 24-28 | | 7 | Ireland | 2.2 | 1.9 | 25.8 | 6.8 | .2 |
| Iran | 22.0 | 1.9 | 42-48 | 23-27 | 33.1 | Ireland | 2.8 | 1.3 | 22.2 | 11.8 | 2.9 |
| Iraq | 7.0 | 1.8 | 47-51 | | 13.8 | Luxembourg | .3 | .9 | 16.0 | 12.5 | .4 |
| Israel | 2.5 | 3.5 | 24.6 | 6.2 | 3.1 | Netherlands | 12.1 | 1.3 | 20.8 | 8.0 | 14.1 |
| Jordan | 1.9 | 2.3 | 43-47 | | 3.4 | Norway | 3.7 | .8 | 17.5 | 10.0 | 4.3 |
| Kuwait | .3 | | 37-43 | | .3 | Sweden | 7.6 | .5 | 14.8 | 10.1 | 8.4 |
| Lebanon | 1.8 | | | | 3.1 | United Kingdom | 54.1 | .8 | 18.5 | 12.2 | 57.3 |
| Saudi Arabia | 6.6 | | | | 9.4 | Central Europe: | | | | | |
| Syria | 5.4 | 3.2 | | | 9.3 | Austria | 7.2 | .6 | 18.7 | 12.7 | 7.3 |
| Turkey | 30.8 | 2.6 | 44-48 | | 48.5 | Czechoslovakia | 14.0 | .7 | 16.9 | 9.5 | 15.8 |
| Yemen | 5.0 | | | | 6.9 | Germany, East | 16.1 | 1.3 | 17.5 | 13.7 | 17.6 |
| South-central Asia: | | | (43) | (21) | | Germany, West ⁸ | 56.2 | 1.3 | 18.1 | 11.4 | 58.5 |
| Afghanistan | 14.9 | | 45-53 | | 22.1 | Hungary | 10.1 | .4 | 12.1 | 9.9 | 10.7 |
| Bhutan | .7 | | | | 1.0 | Poland | 31.1 | 1.3 | 19.0 | 7.5 | 38.0 |
| Ceylon | 10.9 | 2.7 | 35.8 | 8.5 | 18.3 | Switzerland | 5.9 | 2.1 | 18.9 | 9.6 | 6.3 |
| India | 468.5 | 2.3 | 38-43 | 21-23 | 661.5 | Southern Europe: | | | | | |
| Nepal | 9.9 | 1.6 | 46-54 | | 14.1 | Albania | 1.8 | 3.2 | 39.3 | 10.7 | 3.0 |
| Pakistan | 100.7 | 2.1 | 43-46 | 16-17 | 153.6 | Bulgaria | 8.2 | .9 | 16.4 | 8.2 | 9.3 |
| Southeast Asia: | | | (49) | (23) | | Greece | 8.5 | .8 | | | 9.5 |
| Burma | 24.2 | 2.1 | 47-53 | 33-37 | 35.0 | Italy | 50.8 | .6 | 19.1 | 10.2 | 56.4 |
| Cambodia | 5.9 | | 47-53 | | 9.8 | Malta | .3 | .5 | 20.4 | 8.9 | .4 |
| Indonesia | 102.2 | 2.2 | 40-46 | 19-23 | 152.8 | Portugal | 9.1 | .7 | 23.5 | 10.8 | 9.8 |
| Laos | 2.0 | 2.5 | | | 18.1 | Rumania | 19.0 | .9 | 15.7 | 8.3 | 22.3 |
| Malaysia | 10.9 | 3.3 | 40.9 | 8.6 | 55.8 | Spain | 31.3 | .8 | 21.5 | 9.0 | 36.0 |
| Philippines | 31.2 | 3.2 | 44-48 | 19-21 | 47.5 | Yugoslavia | 19.3 | 1.1 | 21.4 | 8.9 | 22.8 |
| Thailand | 29.7 | 3.0 | 40-44 | | 24.5 | Oceania: | | | | | |
| Vietnam, North | 17.8 | 3.4 | | | 21.9 | Australia | 11.1 | 2.1 | 21.6 | 8.7 | 14.6 |
| Vietnam, South | 15.9 | 3.7 | 40-48 | | | New Zealand | 2.6 | 2.2 | 25.5 | 8.8 | 3.7 |
| | | | | | | U.S.S.R. | 228.6 | 1.7 | 22.4 | 7.5 | 277.8 |

¹ Compiled from United Nations and other sources.² Latest available year. In no case before circa 1960.³ Medium projection (provisional U.N. estimates, 1964).⁴ Non-self-governing country.⁵ Formerly Nyasaland. Gained independence July 6, 1964.⁶ Formerly known as the United Republic of Tanganyika and Zanzibar.⁷ Formerly Northern Rhodesia. Gained independence Oct. 24, 1964.⁸ Excludes West Berlin, population 2,200,000 (1964).

Note: Parentheses indicate regional vital rates. Blank space indicates lack of reliable statistics.

World and continental population estimates
(In millions)

| | Mid-1964 | 1980 projection ¹ |
|---------------------------|----------|------------------------------|
| World total | 3,233 | 4,274 |
| Africa | 303 | 449 |
| Asia | 1,843 | 2,404 |
| North America | 211 | 267 |
| Central and South America | 226 | 374 |
| Europe | 443 | 479 |
| Oceania | 18 | 23 |
| U.S.S.R. | 229 | 278 |

¹ Medium projection (provisional U.N. estimates, 1964).

Population increase at various rates of growth

| Annual increase rate (percent): | Number of years to double population | In 1 century 10,000,000 increases to— |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 0.5 | 139 | 16,000,000 |
| 1 | 70 | 27,000,000 |
| 1.5 | 47 | 44,000,000 |
| 2 (world rate) | 35 | 72,000,000 |
| 2.5 | 28 | 118,000,000 |
| 3 | 23 | 192,000,000 |
| 3.5 | 20 | 312,000,000 |
| 4 | 18 | 505,000,000 |

Mr. DIRKSEN. So, Mr. President, the third reading having been had, I am prepared to vote, and I hope the bill will pass.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, immigration and naturalization laws developed in the 18th and 19th centuries with the spread of nationalism. Since the concept of the modern nation state goes back only to the Protestant Reformation, it is understandable that laws governing the movement of large numbers of people would come about only with the growth of this concept and the

improvement of transportation facilities. The states of Europe which emerged from the religious schism had the effect of giving an identity to local populations which made up the whole of Christendom. The demise of the Holy Roman Empire and the diminished authority of the papacy brought about a strong sense of nationalism to the principalities of Europe and increased the temporal and spiritual authority of local princes.

With the discovery of the Western Hemisphere and the improvement in transportation, the emigration of large populations became a matter of state policy for the first time. European countries bordering on the North Atlantic had a decided interest in colonizing their territorial claims in this hemisphere. The competition among the colonial powers further developed a sense of nationalism which spread to the Americas.

Nationalism is a feeling on the part of a citizen that his country is a living entity which will continue on after his death and that it is his duty to protect its existence and work for its continuation in the same form that he has known it. Nationalism engenders a spirit of unity among a people and a homogeneous population is one of its earmarks.

However archaic and antiquated nationalism is today, it must be recognized as a driving force in the world which still must be contended with. The vast gulf of cultural, racial and economic differences tends to further drive nations apart, especially in this day of rapid transportation and communication.

It is in this historic context that the United States as the primary recipient of European immigration has had to examine its policy of admitting aliens. The problems did not become acute nor was it a matter of great concern, until the middle 1800's, when this Nation began to industrialize, and at the same time, large numbers of South Europeans began to come here.

As long as we had free lands and the population remained culturally and racially the same, there was little need for immigration laws. When that situation began to change in the early 20th century, it became necessary for the United States to protect itself by the enactment of restrictive legislation on immigration. It is with this background in mind that I propose to discuss House bill 2580.

Mr. President, the purpose of H.R. 2580, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act is: First, to abolish the national origins quota system; and second, the repeal of the so-called Asia-Pacific triangle;

Since 1924, the United States officially established a policy of admitting immigrants to this country on the basis of national origins already represented in the United States. It was the purpose and intention of Congress in 1924 to maintain and continue the racial, ethnic and cultural traditions of the United States by admitting immigrants in proportion to their American counterparts. It was the intention of Congress that the United States should continue to be a Christian nation, populated primarily by those nationalities which compose Western Europe today.

It is now proposed that we change this system of immigration in favor of a "first come, first served" basis. It has been said that we are a nation of immigrants.

This is, of course, true, with the exception of the American Indian. However, the United States is no longer in the age of infancy or adolescence, nor is it a vast continental area largely unpopulated. The United States is today a mature, sophisticated, highly industrialized and densely populated nation. Today, only the politicians are aware of the hyphenated Americans. The great mass of American people consider themselves only American, and this is true whether their name is "Jones" or "Janowsky."

It is contended by the advocates of immigration policy change that since 1924 the United States has abandoned its traditional concept that all are welcome and that our historic plea has been in the words of the old invitation, "give us your suffering, your homeless masses."

I submit, and history will bear me out, that the United States, from its earliest beginnings, at no time encouraged the indiscriminate migration of foreigners to our shores. The Immigration and Nationality Service states that:

Thomas Jefferson thought it unwise to encourage immigration from monarchical governments. George Washington viewed unrestricted immigration with caution. When John Quincy Adams was Secretary of State in 1819, he stated that the Government had never officially encouraged immigration from Europe. Adams declared that immigrants were not to expect favors.

The Alien Act of 1798 empowered the President to deport any alien whom he considered dangerous to the Government. Although no immigration laws governing immigration of aliens to the United States were passed until 1875, no one advocated the opening of the floodgates to unrestricted immigration from Asia, Africa, Latin America or other areas of the world with populations dissimilar from our own. In 1875, Congress passed the first law preventing the physically and mentally ill from immigrating to the United States.

In 1882, Congress enacted the first general immigration law and excluded the mentally incompetent, convicts, and those likely to become public charges. In that same year, Congress also adopted a Chinese exclusion policy.

With rapid industrialization following the War Between the States and the beginning of the emergence of the United States as a great power, it is not at all surprising that Congress wished to protect the citizens of this country by being more selective in those whom it permitted to immigrate here. This was a period of the burgeoning technological growth and advancement of organized labor. This was a period when it became the duty of Congress to protect the American workman from the importation of Chinese coolie labor and other cheap labor supply. There is a strange attitude in this country today on the part of some people who feel that this land and its material wealth do not rightfully belong to the citizens of this country,

but in effect belong to the world's population at large.

American citizens have been taxed untold billions of dollars to support foreign governments and foreign peoples. Now we are being asked to surrender the country itself to the world's hordes who are just waiting for the immigration barriers to be lowered. Every public official in this Government knows the power of bloc voting. Bad as it is today, I dread that time which will come in the near future, if this bill is passed, when aliens will dominate the political process in this country.

Literacy is no longer a prerequisite to voting in this country, particularly in the South, and it has been strongly urged that a knowledge of the English language is not necessary. Those who wish to denounce me as a bigot may do so, but I for one want this Nation to remain Christian and civilized in the Western European and American sense of the word.

For those who worry about our image overseas and in the eyes of foreigners, I will have more to say about that in a few minutes.

To return to the historical development of immigration in the United States, in the 32 years between 1850 and 1882, more than 200,000 Chinese immigrated to the United States, which almost approximated the same number of immigrants from all over the world who came to these shores in the first 70 years of our Colonial existence. The famine in the Canton region of China is said to be responsible for the huge Chinese immigration in the latter half of the 19th century. Who knows what future famine may occur in northern Brazil, in India or in Asia, which may cause similar mass migration to this country if the national origin system is abandoned.

We have become a Nation highly industrialized, highly urbanized, with a rural population dwindling swiftly with each passing year. With our vast amount of land in this country our coastal areas are being swamped with population increases. I do not have the figures available, but I believe it is almost a certainty that most of the immigrants who have come to this country in the last 20 or 30 years have settled in the large urban areas of the Nation, particularly the east and west coasts.

I am reminded of Thomas Jefferson's partiality for an agrarian system, when he wrote to James Madison in 1787. He said:

This reliance cannot deceive us as long as we remain virtuous; and I think we shall be so as long as agriculture is our principal object, which will be the case while there remain vacant lands in any part of America. When we get piled upon one another in large cities as in Europe, we shall become corrupt as in Europe, and go to eating one another as they do there.

Who can look at our great cities today and say unequivocally that Jefferson was wrong? Make no mistake about the immigrants who come to this country. They are not going to go down on the farm; the farm does not need them. They are going to install themselves in the Harlems, the Watts, the South Bostons and other over-crowded areas,

plagued by poverty, ignorance and disease. The attempt to diffuse and assimilate the Hungarian refugees of 1956 failed miserably. By and large they returned to the big cities.

In 1891, Congress passed the second general immigration law and provided for the medical inspection of all newly arrived immigrants. It barred paupers, polygamists and those suffering from contagious diseases. That law also provided for the deportation of all aliens illegally admitted to the United States, and further created the Office of Superintendent of Immigration. Between 1893 and 1907, Congress passed several laws to further tighten the restrictions on the admission of the insane, professional beggars, anarchists and other undesirable. It was also during this time that Congress empowered the President to enter into international agreements regulating immigration, and this led to the so-called gentlemen's agreement which Theodore Roosevelt made with Japan.

In 1917 Congress codified all previous provisions which applied to the exclusion of aliens and included in this list of ineligible persons who were illiterate, psychopathic, chronic alcoholics, vagrants, and persons entering for immoral purposes. The law also prevented immigration of persons coming from the geographical area known as the Asiatic barred zone.

In 1921 Congress enacted the first quota law and it limited the number of any nationality entering the United States to 3 percent of foreign-born persons of that nationality who lived in the United States in 1910. Under this law, approximately 350,000 aliens were permitted to enter the country each year.

In 1924, Congress enacted the first permanent quota law and provided for the national origins system which, however, did not become effective until July 1929. From 1924 to 1929, the quota was set at 2 percent of the foreign-born residents in the United States in 1890. This reduced the yearly quota to about 164,667 persons. Under the national origins provisions, a quota was set up for each nationality. All quotas were a

certain percentage of the foreign-born residents of each nationality in the United States in 1920. From 1929 the annual quotas totaled 153,714. Under the 1924 act, certain aliens were admitted as nonquota immigrants. Persons entitled to be admitted as nonquota under that act included those born in Western Hemisphere countries, their wives, husbands, and children.

The Western Hemisphere countries included Canada, Mexico, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Haiti, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela. The law further provided that wives, husbands, and children of U.S. citizens would be admitted as nonquota immigrants, together with clergymen and their families, and persons who previously had been American citizens.

In 1940, Congress passed the Alien Registration Act which required the registration and fingerprinting of all aliens who were in the United States and those who sought to enter.

In 1943, the Chinese Exclusion Act was repealed.

In 1945, the War Brides Act was passed to permit special entry of wives of Armed Forces personnel.

The following year Congress permitted Filipinos and persons belonging to races native to India the privilege of admission to the United States. Also in 1946, the Congress enacted the G.I. Flances Act which permitted entry into the country of flances of Armed Forces personnel.

The Displaced Persons Act of 1948 permitted the immigration of 205,000 displaced persons over a period of 2 years.

It should be remembered that these special acts passed by Congress during and after the war permitting additional immigration were over and above those admitted under the yearly quota system.

In 1952, Congress enacted the Immigration and Nationality Act, which is better known as the McCarran-Walter Act. This law repealed all existing immigration and nationality laws and re-

vised and codified all legislation dealing with immigration.

Under this act, the total immigration quotas remained substantially the same as in previous acts; however, the first 50 percent—first preference—of the quota was reserved to certain highly skilled or educated persons whose immigration would be of advantage to the United States. Second preference was given to alien parents of U.S. citizens and third preference to spouses or children of aliens who had been admitted as immigrants. The act also set up maximum quotas of 100 each for colonies and dependent areas of parent countries. The McCarran-Walter Act is still the basic law today, and it is this legislation which we are now considering for revision by the proposals contained in S. 500.

Since 1952, Congress has amended the McCarran Act and also passed special legislation for the admission of refugees. In 1953, the Refugee Relief Act authorized 209,000 persons to enter the United States as nonquota immigrants.

Further changes were made in 1957; and in 1958, Congress made it possible for the Hungarian refugees to come to the United States under Public Law 85-559. Minor changes were made in 1961, and in 1962 Congress enacted the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act and provided for assistance to refugees in the appropriation of funds to assist those who came from the Western Hemisphere countries.

This was specially designed to assist the Cuban refugees fleeing Communist persecution on that island. Also in 1962, other minor changes were made in the Immigration and Nationality Act which affected preference and priority provisions of the law.

At this point in my remarks I would like to introduce a table prepared by the Immigration and Naturalization Service which contains the figures on the numbers of immigrants admitted since 1946 through June 30, 1964.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Immigrant aliens admitted to the United States by classes under the immigration laws, years ended June 30, 1946-52

| Class | 1946-52 | 1946 | 1947 | 1948 | 1949 | 1950 | 1951 | 1952 |
|--|-------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Total immigrants admitted | 3, 114, 168 | 108, 721 | 147, 292 | 170, 670 | 188, 317 | 249, 187 | 205, 717 | 265, 520 |
| Total quota immigrants | 1, 500, 425 | 29, 095 | 70, 701 | 92, 526 | 113, 046 | 197, 460 | 156, 547 | 194, 247 |
| Immigration Act of May 1924, and Immigration and Nationality Act | 1, 083, 134 | 29, 006 | 70, 618 | 92, 426 | 73, 075 | 64, 769 | 58, 356 | 74, 037 |
| Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (quota) | 405, 535 | | | | 39, 899 | 132, 577 | 97, 960 | 119, 982 |
| Other acts | 1, 756 | 89 | 83 | 100 | 72 | 114 | 231 | 228 |
| Total nonquota immigrants | 1, 613, 743 | 79, 626 | 76, 591 | 78, 044 | 75, 271 | 51, 727 | 49, 170 | 71, 273 |
| Immigration Act of May 26, 1924, and Immigration and Nationality Act | 1, 221, 378 | 33, 809 | 49, 128 | 54, 603 | 52, 337 | 49, 479 | 48, 157 | 68, 881 |
| Wives of U.S. citizens | 200, 508 | 2, 904 | 5, 962 | 8, 132 | 7, 297 | 10, 735 | 8, 680 | 16, 058 |
| Husbands of U.S. citizens | 49, 576 | 208 | 478 | 553 | 3, 168 | 1, 453 | 822 | 793 |
| Children of U.S. citizens | 57, 886 | 598 | 5, 087 | 5, 129 | 3, 175 | 2, 393 | 1, 946 | 2, 464 |
| Natives of Western Hemisphere countries, their spouses and children | 886, 588 | 29, 502 | 35, 640 | 37, 968 | 36, 394 | 33, 238 | 35, 266 | 48, 391 |
| Persons who had been U.S. citizens | 1, 342 | 63 | 91 | 136 | 110 | 86 | 39 | 32 |
| Ministers of religious denominations, their spouses and children | 9, 560 | 432 | 1, 336 | 1, 592 | 1, 233 | 833 | 731 | 578 |
| Professors of colleges, academics, or universities, their wives and children | 4, 180 | 102 | 534 | 997 | 869 | 603 | 457 | 297 |
| Other nonquota immigrants | 11, 738 | | | 96 | 91 | 138 | 216 | 268 |
| War Brides Act of Dec. 28, 1945 | 119, 693 | | | | | | | |
| Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (nonquota) | 4, 157 | 45, 557 | 27, 212 | 23, 016 | 22, 214 | 1, 664 | | |
| Refugee Relief Act of 1953 | 188, 980 | | | | 314 | 233 | 595 | 1, 982 |
| Act of Sept. 11, 1957 (Public Law 85-316) | 49, 301 | | | | | | | |
| Act of July 25, 1958, Hungarian parolees adjusting status | 25, 424 | | | | | | | |
| Act of Sep. 2, 1958, Azores and Netherlands refugees | 1, 187 | | | | | | | |
| Other acts | 3, 653 | 280 | 261 | 425 | 406 | 321 | 418 | 410 |

Immigrants admitted to the United States by classes under the immigration laws, years ended June 30, 1953-64—Continued

| Class | 1953-64 | 1953 ¹ | 1954 | 1955 | 1956 | 1957 | 1958 | 1959 | 1960 | 1961 | 1962 | 1963 | 1964 |
|--|-----------|-------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Total immigrants admitted | 3,197,857 | 170,434 | 208,177 | 237,790 | 321,625 | 326,867 | 253,265 | 260,686 | 265,398 | 271,344 | 283,763 | 306,260 | 202,248 |
| Quota immigrants, total | 1,140,479 | 84,175 | 94,098 | 82,232 | 89,310 | 97,178 | 102,153 | 97,657 | 101,373 | 96,104 | 90,319 | 103,035 | 102,844 |
| Immigration and Nationality Act | 1,124,863 | 78,053 | 88,016 | 79,617 | 88,825 | 97,084 | 102,077 | 97,551 | 101,352 | 96,074 | 90,305 | 102,995 | 102,814 |
| 1st preference quota: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Selected immigrants of special skill or ability | 30,600 | 77 | 1,429 | 1,778 | 1,946 | 2,992 | 3,941 | 3,518 | 3,385 | 3,400 | 3,313 | 2,288 | 2,475 |
| Their spouses and children | 28,676 | 45 | 1,027 | 1,230 | 1,420 | 2,739 | 3,179 | 3,109 | 3,681 | 3,758 | 3,721 | 2,374 | 2,387 |
| Skilled agriculturalists, their wives and children (1924 act) | 321 | 321 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Parents or husbands of U.S. citizens (1924 act) | 4,290 | 4,290 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2d preference quota: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Parents of U.S. citizens | 35,847 | 983 | 2,783 | 2,394 | 2,843 | 3,077 | 2,608 | 3,406 | 3,451 | 3,381 | 2,252 | 4,006 | 4,063 |
| Unmarried sons or daughters of U.S. citizens ² | 2,409 | | | | | | | | 375 | 931 | 341 | 392 | 309 |
| Wives and children of resident aliens (1924 act) | 4,133 | 4,133 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3d preference quota: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Spouses of resident aliens | 28,450 | 291 | 3,180 | 2,604 | 2,902 | 2,848 | 2,719 | 3,409 | 2,787 | 2,132 | 1,785 | 1,832 | 1,980 |
| Unmarried sons or daughters of resident aliens ³ | 36,618 | 220 | 2,824 | 2,821 | 4,064 | 3,783 | 2,668 | 4,134 | 3,225 | 3,205 | 2,419 | 3,266 | 3,929 |
| 4th preference quota: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Brothers or sisters of U.S. citizens | 22,406 | 63 | 1,556 | 1,955 | 1,690 | 1,715 | 2,903 | 2,162 | 1,955 | 2,346 | 2,162 | 2,187 | 1,711 |
| Married sons or daughters of U.S. citizens ² | 7,928 | 22 | 374 | 1,120 | 431 | 1,443 | 2,029 | 1,275 | 426 | 244 | 205 | 199 | 161 |
| Spouses and children of brothers or sisters, sons or daughters of U.S. citizens ⁴ | 11,580 | | | | | | | | 1,044 | 2,572 | 2,548 | 2,887 | 2,629 |
| Adopted sons or daughters of U.S. citizens ⁵ | 137 | | | | | | | | 55 | 52 | 16 | 1 | 3 |
| Nonpreference quota | 911,408 | 67,608 | 74,843 | 65,711 | 73,529 | 77,887 | 82,030 | 76,638 | 80,987 | 73,023 | 71,542 | 83,563 | 83,207 |
| Special legislation (quota immigrants) | 15,616 | 6,122 | 6,082 | 2,615 | 485 | 94 | 76 | 6 | 21 | 30 | 14 | 41 | 30 |
| Displaced persons, Displaced Persons Act of 1948 (quota) | 15,121 | 5,759 | 6,082 | 2,615 | 485 | 94 | 76 | 5 | | | | 3 | 1 |
| Skilled sheepherders, act of Apr. 9, 1952 (quota) | 363 | 363 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Foreign government officials adjusted under sec 13, act of Sept. 11, 1957 (quota) | 132 | | | | | | | | 21 | 30 | 11 | 40 | 30 |
| Nonquota immigrants, total | 2,057,378 | 86,259 | 114,079 | 155,558 | 232,315 | 229,689 | 151,112 | 163,029 | 164,025 | 175,240 | 193,444 | 203,224 | 189,404 |
| Immigration and Nationality Act | 1,681,285 | 85,015 | 112,854 | 129,136 | 156,808 | 147,243 | 125,591 | 111,341 | 133,087 | 152,382 | 169,346 | 183,283 | 178,200 |
| Wives of U.S. citizens | 235,980 | 5,916 | 17,145 | 18,504 | 21,244 | 21,794 | 23,517 | 22,620 | 21,521 | 20,012 | 17,316 | 17,590 | 19,701 |
| Husbands of U.S. citizens | 73,418 | 3,859 | 7,725 | 6,716 | 5,788 | 5,767 | 5,833 | 6,913 | 6,140 | 6,059 | 6,546 | 6,035 | 6,437 |
| Children of U.S. citizens | 70,896 | 3,268 | 5,819 | 5,662 | 4,710 | 4,798 | 5,970 | 6,859 | 6,454 | 6,480 | 6,354 | 6,981 | 7,531 |
| Natives of Western Hemisphere countries | 1,227,778 | 58,565 | 78,897 | 92,620 | 122,083 | 111,344 | 86,523 | 66,386 | 89,566 | 110,140 | 130,741 | 144,677 | 135,815 |
| Their spouses and children | 27,482 | 2,114 | 1,629 | 1,654 | 1,949 | 2,144 | 2,062 | 1,810 | 2,135 | 2,696 | 2,764 | 3,067 | 3,468 |
| Persons who had been U.S. citizens | 902 | 104 | 427 | 87 | 44 | 58 | 43 | 22 | 30 | 15 | 25 | 23 | 18 |
| Ministers of religious denominations, their spouses and children | 5,107 | 387 | 385 | 307 | 350 | 403 | 435 | 558 | 485 | 406 | 451 | 462 | 478 |
| Employees of U.S. Government abroad, their spouses, and children | 205 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 2 | 8 | 23 | 24 | 27 | 10 | 3 | 32 | 61 |
| Children born abroad to resident aliens or subsequent to issuance of visa | 12,117 | 326 | 353 | 343 | 412 | 701 | 926 | 1,228 | 1,458 | 1,411 | 1,495 | 1,611 | 1,843 |
| Aliens adjusted under sec. 249, Immigration and Nationality Act ⁶ | 22,795 | | | | | | | 4,321 | 4,773 | 5,037 | 3,399 | 2,630 | 2,535 |
| Other nonquota immigrants | 3,605 | 554 | 455 | 228 | 226 | 226 | 269 | 590 | 392 | 110 | 152 | 125 | 262 |
| Special legislation (nonquota immigrants) | 376,093 | 1,244 | 1,225 | 29,423 | 75,507 | 82,446 | 25,521 | 51,688 | 30,938 | 22,858 | 24,098 | 19,941 | 11,204 |
| Displaced persons, Displaced Persons Act of 1948 (nonquota) | 1,030 | 1,030 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Orphans, act of July 29, 1953 | 466 | | 390 | 67 | | | | | | | | | |
| Refugees, Refugee Relief Act of 1953 | 189,021 | | 821 | 20,002 | 75,473 | 82,444 | 1,012 | 198 | 43 | 9 | 15 | 3 | 1 |
| Skilled sheepherders, act of Sept. 3, 1954 (nonquota) | 385 | | | 354 | 31 | | | | | | | | |
| Immigrants, act of Sept. 11, 1957 | 61,948 | | | | | | 24,467 | 24,534 | 6,612 | 3,982 | 1,809 | 213 | 31 |
| Hungarian parolees, act of July 25, 1958 | 30,701 | | | | | | | 25,424 | 5,087 | 122 | 51 | 20 | 17 |
| Azores and Netherlands refugees, act of Sept. 2, 1958 | 22,213 | | | | | | | 1,187 | 8,870 | 5,472 | 4,796 | 1,888 | |
| Immigrants, secs. 4 and 6, act of Sept. 22, 1959 | 20,337 | | | | | | | | 10,314 | 13,255 | 5,488 | 280 | |
| Immigrants, act of Sept. 26, 1961 | 15,525 | | | | | | | | | | 11,012 | 2,848 | |
| Other nonquota immigrants, special legislation | 412 | 214 | 5 | | 3 | 2 | 42 | 45 | 32 | 18 | 27 | 12 | 12 |
| Refugee escapees, act of July 14, 1960 | 6,111 | | | | | | | | | | | 2,005 | 4,106 |
| Immigrants, act of Oct. 24, 1962 | 18,944 | | | | | | | | | | | 12,572 | 6,272 |

¹ In 1953, figures include admissions under Immigration Act of 1924.

² Prior to act of Sept. 22, 1959, all sons or daughters of U.S. citizens over 21 years of age were classified as 4th preference quota under the Immigration and Nationality Act. Adopted sons and daughters with petitions approved prior to Sept. 22, 1959, remained 4th preference.

³ Prior to act of Sept. 22, 1959, included only children under 21 of resident aliens. Adult sons or daughters of resident aliens were classified as nonpreference quota.

⁴ Prior to act of Sept. 22, 1959, classified as nonpreference quota.

⁵ Not reported prior to 1959.

⁶ Includes 321 professors of colleges and universities and their wives and children.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the figures are broken down into two basic groups of quota immigrants as authorized under the national origin provision of the McCarran-Walter Act and non-quota immigrants who were admitted under other provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act or special legislation enacted by Congress. In the period from 1946 to 1959, some 3,146,168 immigrants were admitted to the United States. Of these, less than half, 1,500,425, were admitted as quota immigrants. The balance were admitted under special legislation or under other provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act which did not contain the limitation of national origins.

I believe that the record will bear out the fact that few countries have been as generous as the United States in accept-

ing the displaced and the homeless peoples of the world.

I cannot understand those who attack our basic law simply because it attempts to continue the cultural heritage, political and social traditions of this Nation. The Congress has been more than generous in departing from the basic law of national origins to take care of special hardship cases such as the Hungarian and Cuban refugees. We have more than met our international responsibilities as a great world power in helping to alleviate the suffering of oppressed people in distressed areas of the world.

It has been argued that, because the United States contains a large land mass, it can absorb countless millions of the world's population. When the vast land area of Alaska is added to that of the

U.S. mainland, it is argued that we can easily accommodate many millions more.

The fact of the matter is the total population of Alaska today is not sufficient to maintain a good-sized town and there is no indication that immigrants coming into this country desire to move to Alaska. I do not have the figures available, but I seriously doubt that any of the Cuban, Hungarian, or other refugees have migrated to Alaska. The truth of the matter is, as I have pointed out earlier, that new immigrants to this country move into the huge urban areas primarily on the east and west coasts and add further to the population explosion problem with which we and the rest of the world are faced. There are no new frontiers in the United States where pioneers can settle and establish

homes for themselves and their children. Using Samuel Lubbell's definition—that a frontier exists where a man faces a fact—the only frontiers remaining in this Nation are those which exist in the sprawling urban areas where the poor and culturally backward groups must fight to maintain a subsistence living. Changes in our immigration law would only add to the ghettos which already abound in our great cities.

I have prepared a table which I am introducing at this point in my remarks, showing a comparison from 1920 through 1964 of the annual immigration figures in relation to the numbers of unemployed in this country.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Immigration, 1920-64

| | Annual Immigration | Unemploy- ment (in thousands) |
|--------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1920..... | 430,001 | (1) |
| 1921..... | 805,228 | (1) |
| 1922..... | 309,556 | (1) |
| 1923..... | 522,919 | (1) |
| 1924..... | 706,896 | (1) |
| 1925..... | 294,314 | (1) |
| 1926..... | 304,488 | (1) |
| 1927..... | 385,175 | (1) |
| 1928..... | 307,265 | (1) |
| 1929..... | 279,678 | 1,850 |
| 1930..... | 241,700 | 4,340 |
| 1931..... | 97,139 | 8,020 |
| 1932..... | 86,576 | 12,060 |
| 1933..... | 28,068 | 12,830 |
| 1934..... | 29,470 | 11,840 |
| 1935..... | 34,956 | 10,610 |
| 1936..... | 36,329 | 9,030 |
| 1937..... | 80,244 | 7,700 |
| 1938..... | 67,895 | 10,390 |
| 1939..... | 82,998 | 8,480 |
| 1940..... | 70,756 | 8,120 |
| 1941-45..... | (2) | (2) |
| 1946..... | 108,721 | 2,270 |
| 1947..... | 147,292 | 2,142 |
| 1948..... | 170,570 | 2,064 |
| 1949..... | 188,317 | 3,395 |
| 1950..... | 249,187 | 3,142 |
| 1951..... | 205,717 | 949 |
| 1952..... | 285,520 | ----- |
| 1953..... | 170,434 | 1,871 |
| 1954..... | 208,177 | 3,580 |
| 1955..... | 237,790 | 2,905 |
| 1956..... | 321,625 | 2,825 |
| 1957..... | 328,867 | 2,930 |
| 1958..... | 253,265 | 4,681 |
| 1959..... | 200,686 | 3,813 |
| 1960..... | 265,398 | 3,971 |
| 1961..... | 271,344 | 4,307 |
| 1962..... | 283,763 | 4,008 |
| 1963..... | 306,260 | 4,166 |
| 1964..... | 292,248 | 3,876 |

¹ Unavailable.

² Figures for war years are not significant because small immigration and small unemployment were due to wartime conditions.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it makes little sense to me to continue to accept large numbers of immigrants when we have almost 4 million unemployed in the United States at the present time. I am personally in favor of halting all immigration for 5 years in order that the problem may be thoroughly studied, with a view to determining the effects of immigration upon the labor market, the success or failure of assimilation of these foreign groups coming into the country, and the effects upon our urban areas. It should always be remembered that immigration is a privilege to be conferred upon foreign persons by the Congress of the United States. No one has a right to become a citizen of this country, and the people of the United States are under no obli-

gation either moral or legal to admit anyone who wishes to enter. As I have stated previously, we are no longer a small group of colonies with a small population where European and other powers have the right to dump their excess population which includes debtors, criminals, and others.

This is a mature country with a complicated social structure requiring citizens with great technical skills who can not only support themselves but who can make worthwhile contributions to the Nation.

I have read with great interest the statements of those who oppose our present immigration policy. They are, as I said before, those persons who apparently feel that the natural resources of this Nation do not belong to its citizens exclusively. They seem to be racked with guilt feelings over the fact that Americans are, by and large, much better off materially and spiritually than most of the world's population.

When the Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Rusk, appeared before the Senate Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization, he made the point that, because of our national origins quota system, it was embarrassing to him to conduct our foreign policy because we showed a peculiar preference to maintain our cultural and political institutions as they have been for almost 200 years.

Mr. Rusk seems to feel it is discrimination on our part because we do not let untold numbers of Orientals come into this country. I had always thought that it was the duty of the Secretary of State and his Department to conduct our foreign policy in a way which was most advantageous to the country and to represent the American people to the rest of the world for what we are and what we believe and what we wish for others. It would appear from Mr. Rusk's statement that we might have to change the whole composition of the Nation in order to make his job easier so that when he holds these interminable and innumerable conferences he cannot be accused of representing a system which discriminates. If we examine Mr. Rusk's complaint and the complaints of those foreign elements who criticize our immigration policy, it seems apparent that there is no basis at all for criticism.

He says that, when a foreigner sits down and reads our immigration law, he is immediately appalled by the fact that we prefer immigrants from western and northern Europe. Let us examine that for a moment; just how many immigrants sit down and read our Immigration Act? Mr. Rusk says that they are not aware of the fact that we have passed innumerable pieces of legislation which have permitted several million people to come into this country without regard to national origin. I suspect that these foreigners are more aware of that than the national origins provision of the McCarran-Walter Act. If they are not sufficiently aware of this legislation, it is a failure on the part of the Department of State to adequately present our position to the peoples of the

rest of the world. We spend a vast amount of money to maintain an agency called the U.S. Information Agency.

If our vast bureaucracy cannot adequately inform the peoples of the world of what we have done for the sake of humanity in admitting countless millions of Hungarian, Cuban, Polish, and other foreign groups into our society, then I believe it is time to question the qualifications of those who purport to head this bureaucracy.

Secretary Rusk is vague as to who these foreigners are who find discrimination in our immigration policy. Could it be the Liberians who permit only Negroes to immigrate to their country? Could it be the Australians who bar all Negroes and Orientals from entering the country "down under"? Could it be the Arabs who do not allow the infidel Christians to approach closer than 12 miles to Mecca and Medina? I was recently informed that the National Broadcasting Co. is going to establish a TV system for Saudi Arabia and that they first had to train Saudians nationals in the operation of technical equipment because only the faithful could enter these holy cities of Mecca and Medina.

Could the foreigners who criticize the United States be Africans, particularly from those new countries who do not admit any Westerners except under limited conditions? Could it be those black nationalists who are crying "Africa for the Africans?" I must say that I am at a loss to know who these foreigners are who the Secretary of State shows such deference to and whose criticism makes his job so burdensome.

According to the administration's new immigration proposals, the national origins quota system would be phased out over a 5-year period. Mr. Rusk says that this is necessary because if we did not do that those countries in Western and Northern Europe which now have priority would be swamped by the Asians and Africans coming into the United States, and that, because we must be respectful of the sensibilities of our allies—England, Germany, France, Italy—we cannot abruptly terminate this preferential treatment.

In other words, our NATO alliance might encounter difficulties if the immigration bars are suddenly lowered on a first-come, first-served basis. This system of first-come, first-served would completely push Western Europe to one side. Mr. Rusk goes on to say that we are going to show preferential treatment to the highly skilled and the superbly trained. In admitting immigrants on a first-come, first-served basis, does he expect these people to come here from Tobago, the Congo, or Indonesia? I respectfully submit that the superbly trained will come either from Western and Northern Europe or they will not come at all.

Secretary Rusk says in his statement before the Senate subcommittee:

The governments of these newly independent nations (Jamaica and Trinidad-Tobago) have made strong representations to our Government, asking to be placed on equal footing with other American states.

September 22, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

It is interesting to note that Trinidad-Tobago has banned practically all immigration into that country, especially from Jamaica and Barbados. It makes one wonder. I sincerely regret that these "strong representations" from Tobago have caused our Secretary of State to tremble in the exercise of his office.

Mr. Rusk goes further in saying:

As a leader in the struggle for freedom, we are expected to exemplify all that freedom means. We have proclaimed again and again, from the Declaration of Independence until the present day, that freedom is the right of all men. The rest of the world watches us closely to see whether or not we live up to the great principles we have proclaimed and promoted. Our blemishes delight our enemies and dismay our friends.

I do not see how any reasonable or responsible foreigner could gain the impression from our Declaration of Independence or from any of our other statements of principle that there is a legal or moral right for the world's population to move into our country. I am very much afraid that the Secretary of State has permitted Communist propaganda attacks upon our country to sway his good judgment. It is unfortunate that some foreigners may also have been taken in by these attacks upon American principle. I cannot see how anyone of reasonable intelligence can really blame the American people for wishing to maintain their cultural, ethnic, and political traditions in their historic context. My experience in traveling in the countries of the world has been that these people are not so naive or unsophisticated as to expect us to change the composition of this country to satisfy some criticism at this moment in history.

In considering the charge that American immigration policy discriminates, it is only necessary to examine the policies of other nations to readily establish that they all show a strong preference for people culturally and racially similar to their own. Some nations exclude immigrants strictly on the basis of race and religion. However, other than those nations which have these outright bans on certain groups, most countries empower a Cabinet officer, usually the Minister of Labor or Immigration, with total discretion in admitting immigrants. The laws of other countries are usually vague and the particular immigration official is guided only by considerations of labor supply, the health and character of the immigrant and the ability to become readily assimilated into the native population. It is this wide discretion which other nations use to maintain an unofficial national origins system.

Persons of foreign races are always most difficult to assimilate and, therefore, constitute a moral basis for the Minister of Labor to exclude them.

The 1952 Immigration Act of Canada, while not distinguishing specifically between races, empowers the Canadian officials with the right to exclude anyone who indicates a probable inability to become readily assimilated, or to assume the duties and responsibilities of Canadian citizenship within a reasonable time after their admission.

The Scandinavian countries show a decided preference in their laws for their own kind. Germany and Austria have special arrangements governing the interchange of citizens. There are a number of countries in the world which have no immigration policy whatever, and this is due to the fact that they are overpopulated and have been primarily concerned with emigration.

I am not at all critical of the immigration policies of other countries because of the fact that they are similar to our own. I submit that they have a reasonable basis for showing a preference for their own and that no country can be expected to import problems approaching the insoluble.

It is easily understandable to me why Britons prefer to chance the destruction of the Commonwealth rather than the destruction of the United Kingdom by passing by the Commonwealth Immigrants Act of 1962. One need only look at the present India-Pakistan war, or the secession of Singapore from Malaysia to appreciate the valid and legitimate reasons for making distinctions of race and religion in immigration policy.

I would like to quote a short excerpt from Kenneth Rivett's book "Immigration: Control or Colour Bar," Melbourne, 1962, in which he discusses the 1952 Immigration Act of Canada.

I have selected this reference material as indicative of most nations' policy on immigration and naturalization. The quotation from this book is as follows:

The 1952 Immigration Act (of Canada) did not distinguish specifically between European and Asian migrants, but left the government power to issue regulations governing the admission or exclusion of migrants (under art. 81) on grounds of:

I. Nationality, citizenship, ethnic origin, occupation, class or geographical area of origin;

II. Peculiar customs, habits, modes of life, or method of holding property;

III. Unsuitability having regard to climatic, economic, social, industrial, educational, labor, health, or other conditions * * * in Canada.

IV. Probable inability to become readily assimilated or to assume the duties and responsibilities of Canadian citizenship within a reasonable time after admission.

In general, these powers have been applied to limit nonwhite immigration very drastically, so that there is clearly a "racial" basis to Canada's policy, just as there is to Australia's. Yet it has not given rise to anything like the same degree of offense. One reason has been the negotiation of agreements with India, Pakistan and Ceylon, from which 300 (originally 150), 100 and 59 immigrants are admitted respectively each year.

It is significant that the quota for Ceylon has generally not been filled, whereas in India over 20,000 people applied for the 150 places.

Mr. President, when the McCarran-Walter bill was sent to the White House in 1952 for approval by President Truman, he vetoed it. I voted to override the Presidential veto.

I have since resisted any substantial changes in that act, and I am not now willing to vote for all the changes proposed. I would be willing, as I said earlier, to suspend our immigration laws for, say, 5 years. I know that Congress

is unwilling to take such a step in the light of the hearings had on the pending bill and expressions heretofore made by Members of Congress. I applaud the action taken by the Committee on the Judiciary in limiting immigration from the countries in the Western Hemisphere, but I cannot see my way clear to supporting the pending measure, and I shall vote against it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, would the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts yield to me so that I may address certain questions to him at this time relating to the pending bill?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I am delighted to yield to the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I have received what amounts to almost a flood of mail from the people of my State opposing the enactment of this bill.

I have tried to express in the form of a few questions matters which seem to be disturbing them most. It is as to those questions which I will address my friend, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, believing that it might be a good thing to have the answers to these questions assembled in one place in the Record so that they can be easily furnished to the many people who have these particular objections to the proposed bill.

First, I have many letters stating that it is understood that under this bill, according to the best estimate, the number of immigrants to our Nation will be increased by something like 60,000 to 70,000 per year over the current volume of immigration.

I wish to ask the Senator if that is correct. I heard him the other day and I believe I heard him mention 60,000 people.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Yes. It would be between 50,000 and 60,000 and it might go up to 70,000 to 80,000. The best judgment of the people concerned with this matter is an estimate between 50,000 and 60,000.

Mr. HOLLAND. Apparently there is a good estimate running as high as 70,000 from various well-informed sources that have reached me.

Let us say the distinguished Senator is of the feeling that the number will be increased. As I understand him he believes the best estimate is between 50,000 and 60,000.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. That is correct. I might add to that that under the present law there are about 55,000 quota numbers which are authorized and not used.

I believe last year between 102,000 and 103,000 came in under the quotas, which left about 55,000 not used.

So we expect between 50,000 and 60,000 people to come in over current experience. And this number is about equal to the quota numbers now authorized but wasted.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then the total would approximate 350,000.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I believe that would be correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. The second question that has been raised is this: Under the

23888

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 22, 1965

present condition of continuous unemployment, which apparently is disturbing industry, labor, and Government, and all of us in this Nation, why is it deemed desirable to bring in a substantially increased number of immigrants each year?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I would respond to the distinguished Senator from Florida in two ways.

We had an earlier dialog with the Senator from Iowa relating to this to some extent.

Under the present McCarran-Walter Act, 50 percent of the preferences are given to professionals. That is under the first preference. We have changed that under H.R. 2580 and the first two preferences would go to those with family relationships. Only in the third category, 10 percent of the total, are those that come in as professionals. The fourth and fifth preferences come down to different family relationships. The sixth preference is for skilled and unskilled labor. The seventh preference goes to refugees.

Even those who will come in under the third and sixth preferences, it should be noted that the provisions that will be applied to them will be more stringent than those applicable under the requirements of current law.

I believe we have been able to give assurances, certainly to the AFL-CIO and all the other groups that have been interested and have the responsibility of looking after the welfare of the jobs of American industry, that they will be not only protected in the labor market, but those who come in under these categories would not affect labor standards or conditions under which they would work.

We have had considerable testimony on this subject in committee. The case on it has been very convincing. I read from page 15 of the committee report:

Under the provision of existing law contained in section 212(a)(14) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, foreign labor is subject to exclusion only when the Secretary of Labor certifies that either (1) there are sufficient workers in the United States who are able, willing, available, and qualified at the alien's destination to perform the skilled or unskilled labor, or (2) that the employment of the alien will adversely affect the wages and working conditions of the workers in the United States. This has the effect of excluding any intending immigrant within the scope of the certification who would likely displace a qualified American worker or whose employment in the United States would adversely affect the wages and working conditions of workers similarly employed in the United States. Under the instant bill, this procedure is substantially changed. The primary responsibility is placed upon the intending immigrant to obtain the Secretary of Labor's clearance prior to the issuance of a visa establishing (1) that there are not sufficient workers in the United States at the alien's destination who are able, willing, and qualified to perform the skilled or unskilled labor and (2) that the employment of the alien will not adversely affect wages and working conditions of U.S. citizens similarly employed. The provision is applicable to immigrants from the Western Hemisphere, other than immediate relatives, nonpreference immigrants, and those preference immigrants who seek entrance into the United States for the primary

purpose of gainful employment, whether in a semiskilled or skilled category or as a member of the professions, arts, or sciences. The certification must be obtained in individual cases before a visa may be issued to the intending immigrant.

These are the safeguards which are provided so far as the working people are concerned.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Massachusetts does not believe that the admission of 60,000 more immigrants a year will increase the unemployment problem. Is that correct?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The Senator is correct. I would add that only about 45 percent of new immigrants, on the basis of past immigration experience, would go into the work force. The remainder would be consumers.

As the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong] has pointed out, those who would come in under the third preference would possess particular skills which are needed in the United States. They could fill jobs which today are not filled sufficiently with trained people. By filling these jobs, these people will create more jobs for American workers.

In response to the question of the Senator from Florida, I do not believe that we are endangering either the jobs or the livelihoods of American workers.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. The third question which seems to disturb an undue number of my people, as reflected in the correspondence which I have received, is that they note that the immediate members of a family joining a former immigrant to the United States are not included in the quota.

I believe that applies to the spouses and children, and the father and the mother, and may even go further; but certainly a sizable number of the immediate family are not included in the quota.

Was there any reason for their being excluded from the quota?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. It is based upon the fundamental belief that in our immigration policy we should put a high premium on keeping families together. We feel that if an individual is sufficiently qualified to meet the other criteria, criteria which have been detailed in the bill, he should not be separated from his family, a condition which exists today under the present McCarran-Walter Act.

I refer the Senator to the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, which lists, under the second preference, the number of people, going into the thousands, who have family relationships and are separated from their families. We believe that preference ought to be given to them, and that they should be permitted to come into the country.

We have estimated, as the Senator from Florida has accurately determined, that the number would be between 50,000 and 60,000. They are included in the overall figure, which, as the Senator has indicated, is about 330,000.

Mr. HOLLAND. The fourth question I wish to ask—and I think I know the answer—is this: Is any distinction made between the members of families of im-

migrants already in the United States and those who would come in as new immigrants? Would they be included in the quota or not?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. High preference would be given to unmarried brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens. The first category is unmarried brothers and sisters of aliens. Then the preference goes to professional groups, which is the third preference. The fourth relates to married brothers and sisters. The fifth preference is to brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens. They are the ones who have close family relationship but are not given nonquota status. Therefore, a special nonquota status is given to those who are members of families of U.S. citizens.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not believe the Senator clearly understood my question. My question was this: Is there any difference between relatives of migrants who are already here, whether citizens or not, and relatives of migrants who will be coming in under the bill, as to their being charged or not charged to the quota?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. As I understand the bill, every person who comes as an immigrant is charged to the limitation, except certain relatives of one who is already here as an American citizen.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. That is exactly correct.

Mr. ERVIN. In other words, if an alien is living here as a permanent resident but has not yet become a citizen, relatives may still come in as a part of the quota. Persons who come in outside the limitations are those who are relatives of American citizens.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Relatives of aliens would come in under a lower preference.

Mr. ERVIN. Under the bill, the only persons who could come in from the Eastern Hemisphere, or outside the limitation of 170,000, are children, spouses, and parents of citizens of the United States. There is a further limitation that parents must be the parents of a citizen who is at least 21 years of age.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then there is a difference in the charging to the quota or not charging to the quota as between immigrants already in the United States seeking to bring their relatives in, and those who seek to bring them in with them after the passage of the law.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Florida is making a good point. His question may be misunderstood. His question is this, as I understand: If a person who comes into the United States let us say, in 1970, has relatives abroad, under what condition may he bring the relatives in? It is my understanding that under the bill, whoever comes in in 1970 will have to come in under the overall number.

Mr. HOLLAND. Regardless of how close the relationship is,

Mr. PASTORE. Regardless of how close the relationship is. In other words, the exception is being made as to the people already in the United States; and at the time of the signing of the bill there will be the authority, the exemption, in order to provide for family unification. But beyond that point, any relatives who come in new, so to speak, will come in as immigrants and must be counted among the number.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the family came in under the new law, each one would count regardless, and each would be charged to the quota.

Mr. PASTORE. To the number, not the quota.

Mr. HOLLAND. To the quota.

Mr. PASTORE. I detest the word "quota."

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not share that feeling; but they would be chargeable to that limited number and then would be permitted to come in.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. But that is not the case with reference to some people, where the immigrant is already here under existing law.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is what I wanted to bring out.

My next question is this: A great many people in Florida have moved there from Canada, and we are glad to have them. Many of them have come from Latin America, as the Senator from Massachusetts knows, because he has checked the situation in that State.

We have received numerous complaints from Canadian residents—many of them are citizens now—with reference to what they say would be the first restrictions ever to be imposed upon immigration from Canada, other than restrictions of health, character, and those classifications. Why were the Canadians restricted in the pending measure?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The Canadians are not restricted as a nation, except as they are included in the hemispheric quota.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understand that, but the result is exactly the same.

If there is a limitation in part that applies to Canada and the Caribbean nations, such as Mexico and Central America, and to all of South America, that means that the restriction in part applies to all. The question is, Why was that deemed necessary, considering the very great likeness between the Canadians and ourselves, and the fact that there is no problem at all about assimilating Canadians into our communities?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I was not generally in sympathy with that amendment, so I shall ask the sponsor of the amendment to respond.

Mr. ERVIN. The majority of the subcommittee and the majority of the full committee imposed the limitation of 120,000 on the Western Hemisphere because they felt that if this were to be a bill to abolish discrimination, the bill ought to abolish the most obvious dis-

crimination—that which provided that all the people of the Western Hemisphere could immediately move into the United States, so far as any limitation upon numbers was concerned, whereas only 170,000 could come in from the Eastern Hemisphere.

We who favored a limitation upon immigration on the Western Hemisphere felt that the limitation should be placed now rather than be left open to a future time, when the increase in immigration from the Western Hemisphere might endanger unemployment. In other words, we felt that the nations of the Western Hemisphere should not be allowed to move en masse to the United States, when the nations of the Eastern Hemisphere could not.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished friend for answering that question.

The other horn of the dilemma arises from complaints of those who have come from Latin America. We have perhaps 200,000 to 300,000 of these people in our State at the present time. Many of them are among our finest people. They say that they see no reason or no justification at a time when we are moving ahead with the Alliance for Progress and are setting ourselves up as big brothers of Latin America, in particular, for a restrictive provision relating to Latin American immigration.

I should like to have this question answered, if the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts will answer it, as to why we should be, for the first time, propose restriction.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, as I stated, I am not in sympathy with that provision. Therefore, I should like to have the Senator from North Carolina respond.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the majority of the committee felt that we had reached a point in our Nation's history at which we can no longer have unrestricted immigration from any part of the earth. The figures show that immigration from the Western Hemisphere is now in the neighborhood of 140,000 or 145,000 a year. It has been constantly increasing. Immigration from South America alone has increased by 400 percent in the past 10 years. It is necessary, if we are to have restrictions on immigration, that we should have a restriction on immigration from all areas of the world, and that we ought not to invite all the people of the Western Hemisphere to come into the United States immediately. This defect was the result of the McCarran-Walter Act placing no limitation upon immigration from the Western Hemisphere.

A majority of the subcommittee and a majority of the full committee felt that we ought to place a limitation upon immigration from the Western Hemisphere at this time before the problem became as acute as that which existed in immigration from the Eastern Hemisphere, in 1920, when we received approximately 1,500,000 immigrants in an 18-month period.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I

thank the distinguished Senator. If I understand the situation, the result of that limitation would be to place an immediate reduction on the number of possible immigrants from Canada and the rest of the Western Hemisphere, which limitation would come to a head in about 3 years.

Mr. ERVIN. It would not take effect until July 1, 1968. There would be a period of adjustment, and the number fixed would be approximately the number that comes from the Western Hemisphere at this time.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator.

The last question which has been posed by a good many people is, Why for the first time, are the emerging nations of Africa to be placed on the same basis as are our mother countries, Britain, Germany, the Scandinavian nations, France, the Mediterranean nations, and the other nations from which most Americans have come?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. They are sovereign nations. They are recognized by the United States. There does not appear to be any reason why we should not do so.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator feels that we have not learned anything at all about the difficulties which have arisen from the racial admixtures in our country, and, to the contrary, we are going to open the immigration doors equally to the African nations in the same way that we opened the immigration doors to the Western European nations.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The Senator is correct if he is suggesting that we are going to accept immigrants, regardless of whether they come from Africa or any other country on the basis of what they can contribute to the United States, and not on the basis of their origin or the origin of their parents.

If the question of the Senator is whether we are including the countries of Africa on the same basis as other nations, I am happy to state that the countries of Africa are so included.

The individuals from African nations who apply for admission to the United States will be considered in exactly the same way as individuals coming from Great Britain, France, Ireland, the Scandinavian countries, or any other nation.

Mr. HOLLAND. If I may interpret that statement, the African nations would be placed on exactly an equal status with the nations of Western Europe.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The Senator has stated that accurately.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Florida that I believe the answer to that last question arose from the fact that the President of the United States and a great majority of the Members of the Senate and a great majority of the Members of the House do not entertain the same sound views on immigration that I do. They do not believe that we should continue in exist-

ence the national origins quota system of the McCarran-Walter Act.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am sorry that the distinguished Senator has not been able to prevail in the committee, of which he is a most able member.

I fully agree that the last answer in particular demonstrates a situation which I do not believe is in accord with the experience which we are having in this country and which, to the contrary, runs in the face of the most unpleasant domestic experience which we have ever had, at least within my lifetime, in the United States.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I will answer that question from the standpoint of those who did not entertain my own sound views on this subject. This provision was placed in the bill because a majority of the subcommittee and a majority of the full committee felt that all the nations on earth—that is, all the nations of the Eastern Hemisphere—should be placed in a position of equality in respect to the privilege of immigrating to the United States.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina has stated his position and his reservations about the elimination of the national origins quota system. However, I should like to respond to the Senator from Florida that the provisions of this bill received the overwhelming support of the members of the full committee, with some notable exceptions.

We would not be assuming our full responsibility under this particular bill, nor would we be achieving the aims and aspirations of the people who are concerned with the measure and the American people as a whole unless we clearly provided that our policy on any immigration bill would be based upon the individuals involved and not upon the country from which they came.

I believe that one of the most laudable aspects of the entire bill is the elimination of the racist factor. We have eliminated the Asia-Pacific triangle which was based solely on the basis of origin. I do not see how anyone can stand on the floor of the Senate in 1965 and oppose this legislation after looking at our present legislation which contains the crude Asia-Pacific triangle which provides "If 51 percent of your blood can be traced to that area of the world, you will be chargeable to that area regardless of your birth."

This is the very basic root of this legislation. I am delighted to be asked that question by the Senator from Florida. It is my interpretation, and I believe the interpretation of the majority of the members of the committee, and those who have read the proposed legislation, that the provisions of this bill eliminates all references to race considerations. After we pass this bill—and it will be passed—we shall consider individuals on the basis of their own merit and not consider them solely upon the basis of which country they come from or the basis of their last name, or on the basis of their religion, or the color of their skin.

As many Senators have pointed out, this is a historic occasion. The bill we will pass today will be considered, in the

light of history, as one of the most important accomplishments of this Congress.

There was a time when the drawing of distinctions among immigrants on the basis of nationality was a popular concept. But we have learned something since the 1920's. We have learned that there is no difference between people who participate in the life of our Nation. The refugee scientists who fled Nazi Germany taught us this. The Japanese-Americans who fought and died in our Armed Forces taught us this, and the 400 or more aliens currently fighting in Vietnam are continuing this fine tradition. The displaced persons who have become our community leaders reinforce this point each day. And the hundreds of thousands of immigrants who have come here in recent years, who have prospered and become good Americans and who have strengthened our economy is the final proof. Today we are going to vote the lessons we have learned from them.

And I think it is extremely appropriate that this action is taken this year. It is a natural and logical extension of the increasing quality that we are bringing to our domestic and foreign policy. This is the year we have assured the equal right to vote. This is the year we have assured equality in educational opportunity. This is the year we have eliminated discrimination against the poor and the aged and the members of minority groups who are American citizens. It is only appropriate then that we eliminate this discrimination against people who want to be American citizens.

For if there is one guiding principle to this bill, it is that we are going to treat all men and women who want to come to this country as individuals, equal in the eyes of the law and subject to the same standards. We are not going to ask where they come from or who their fathers were. We will only ask, in the words of President Kennedy, what they can do for this, their new country.

Let us erase forever today the stereotype of the immigrant in our history. The cities of America no longer have the foreign neighborhoods, the cultural islands, separate, unassimilated, a drag on the Nation. They are gone and policies based on them should be gone. The immigrant of today can do a great deal for his country and he should be admitted on that basis.

This bill will also bring our immigration policy in line with the foreign policy of our country.

We have sent tens of thousands of American soldiers to Vietnam to defend the people of that country because we believe that as free people they are worthy of our support. But if the finest citizen of Vietnam wanted to come and live in America today, he would have to wait for many years.

We have made a mighty effort in the United Nations to end the dispute between Pakistan and India, because we admire the Indian people and we admire the Pakistani people and we want them to live in peace. But if the finest citizen of India or Pakistan wanted to come here to live in America, even if he were a doctor, or a scientist or a professor, or

the parent of an American, he would be told, as so many have been told, that they would have to wait for many years.

We poured billions of dollars into the reconstruction of countries like Italy and Greece because we believed in the future of those countries. But even their best qualified citizens today are told that they must wait for many years, if they want to come and make a contribution to this country.

How long can we continue to show these two faces of our foreign policy? How long can we continue to say to the people of these countries "we admire you and respect you and we will help you; but if you want to live among us, we will reject you." I say we can do this no longer. We must conform our immigration policy to our policies as a Nation and our principles as a people.

The numbers involved in this bill are very small compared to the principle which it establishes. The people who will be admitted under it will continue to adjust to our country with the speed and dispatch of past immigrants. New immigrants will make more jobs than they will take. This bill will show the world that in this country by giving opportunity to some, we do not take it away from others, but expand it for all.

I strongly believe that this bill goes to the very central ideals of our country. If there is one principle characteristic that has distinguished us throughout our history it is that we are the land of opportunity. Our streets may not be paved with gold, but they are paved with the promise that men and women who live here—even strangers and new new comers—can rise as fast, as far as their skills will allow—no matter what their name is, no matter what their color is, no matter what their place of birth. We have never fully achieved this ideal. But by striving to approach it, we reaffirm the principles of our country. Where we depart from it we reject those principles. Today we have a chance to reaffirm them.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his very clear answer. I want the Record to show that the many people from my State who have complained to me about this matter are correctly informed. As I understand it now, all nations on earth, including our mother nations of Western Europe, including the merging nations of Africa, including the subcontinent, including the oriental nations, including Latin America, and including Canada, are placed on exactly the same basis because they are nations, and their people would be on exactly the same basis in hoping to come into our country as immigrants to join our own population.

I believe that there could not be a clearer statement of that fact than the statement made by the Senator. While he has made it with considerable fervor, I can understand that, and I believe the Record should show what has been brought out.

I do not believe that what we are being asked to do has been brought out in the Record heretofore. We are being asked to forget about origin, to forget about the percentage of people who are

September 22, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

23891

now here as our nationals and who are being assimilated in the bloodstream of America, to forget about the racial difficulties through which we have passed, not only during the recent clash between the people of the white and the black races, but also during World War II in the other field, as between the white race and the yellow race. We are being asked to forget about any question of that kind. Certainly I shall not find fault with anybody who has come to that conclusion. I do not question the good conscience of anybody who has come to that conclusion. However, insofar as the Senator from Florida is concerned, I believe that we have the complete right as a nation to safeguard ourselves and our own traditions and our own people.

So far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he will never vote for a bill which would place all the nations on earth and the people from all those nations on exactly an equal status as to admission to citizenship in our country.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I heard the Senator refer to the countries of our origin—our mother nations.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Does the Senator agree that there are many citizens in the United States—and they are citizens of the United States—whose mother country or country of origin was one of the countries of Africa, and that they also have a right to be here, as much as somebody who came from one of the Scandinavian countries?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida understands that about one-tenth of the citizenship of our Nation now have African origin. The Senator from Florida, after having talked with a great many people of that origin, has not been able to find many of them who have the slightest idea as to what tribe or nation or area or geographic region their people came from. It is not at all a comparable situation to that of the distinguished Senator from New York, who knows perfectly well where his people came from—Ireland—or to that of the Senator from Florida, who knows perfectly well where his people came from, Germany and England, or to the situations of most of us, or I suppose every one of us.

I see on the floor my distinguished friend from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] whom we all love so deeply, whose ancestry does not have to be announced, because he so clearly comes from wonderful Scandinavian stock. I see other Senators who are very proud to be able to tell where they came from. I am looking at a former Governor from Maine, with whom I talked just the other day, who was exceedingly proud of his background; I believe his people came from Poland. He is a fine representative of that country.

We are all linked to the countries which gave our parents or our ancestors birth. But the same situation does not obtain at all, I say to my distinguished friend, with the people of whom I speak.

I know a great many people of the colored race, and I suspect I have more friends among that race than the Senator would believe. I have yet to find one, in recent years, who has been able to give me much information on the subject which I am discussing.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. May I ask the Senator from Florida a question? Perhaps he could suggest to the Senate why it is that those who came from Africa are unable to say where they came from.

Mr. HOLLAND. They did not come as immigrants; let us put it that way. They were generally brought in on ships that were based in New England, which brought in slaves to the Southland or elsewhere; and, of course, there was no way to check that situation. I have no fault to find with them. I am only stating what is the fact, that those good people have no nationality now, no race to look to, and no home country to look to except the United States, whereas the distinguished Senator from New York has a mother country to which he can look, as I think every Senator present has.

I see in the Chamber my distinguished friend from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], a very great Italian-American, who has been Governor of his great State. Each of us has that sort of situation.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be happy to yield in a minute, but just now I am engaged in a discussion with my friend from New York.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I believe it is correct that my family and my brothers, who are now serving in Government, were aware of the fact that our family originally came from Ireland.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is the Senator not proud of that fact?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. May I finish?

Mr. HOLLAND. Is the Senator proud of that fact?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. May I finish?

Mr. HOLLAND. I hope the Senator will say he is proud of that fact.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. If the Senator will let me finish, I think he will find that I am.

Mr. HOLLAND. All right.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I am very pleased and proud of the fact that our family came from Ireland. I think some of the people the Senator has described to us, whose mother countries are the Scandinavian countries or perhaps Ireland or England or some other countries, were responsible for bringing the people from Africa to the United States in the first place, as slaves. So when the Senator says, after we have performed that kind of unforgivable act, that we should penalize them because they do not know where they came from, nor where in Africa their grandfather was born, as I am fortunate enough to know, I am surprised to hear the Senator from Florida suggest such a philosophy, and that is why I rise, in the back row of the U.S. Senate to speak.

As the Senator from Massachusetts

[Mr. KENNEDY] has said, we are past that period in the history of the United States when we judge a person by his last name or his place of birth or where his grandfather or grandmother came from, or how much money he has or what clubs he belongs to. I hope we shall start anew, to judge people on what their merit is, on what they can contribute to the country, on what they can contribute to their communities, on what they can contribute to their families. That is the whole philosophy of the immigration bill, and that that was the whole philosophy of the civil rights bills of 1963 and 1964 and the voting rights bill of 1965.

I had hoped that the Senator from Florida would accept that point of view. I am very much surprised to hear such a philosophy raised so blatantly on the floor of the U.S. Senate, concerning the fact that we do not know where these Africans came from, that they cannot tell whether they came from the east coast or the west coast, and that therefore they should not be permitted to come here any more.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida was not stating a philosophy; he was merely stating a fact. Our Negro citizens are American citizens. The Senator from Florida has done more in his own State than the Senator from New York has done in his recently adopted State to see that Negro citizens are qualified to vote and that they do vote. He has done many other things to advance their status. But he knows what the fact is. They cannot tell where they came from, and they are not interested in going back anywhere, to a home State or a mother country, as my distinguished friend from New York, of course, takes pride in going back to a particular area of Ireland.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. That does not make me any better person.

Mr. HOLLAND. Certainly not.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The fact that I might know I came from Ireland does not make me any better than a Negro.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator may not be, but I shall let him be the judge of that. The Senator from Florida is stating what is a fact, namely, that the bill, as it is now disclosed on the floor, assumes to open the door to immigration to this country equally wide to people from all the countries of the world, making no distinction between them, except on the basis of communism. I do not believe my distinguished friend excluded that, and that is an excluded situation that I think we should state for the Record. Except for that, the Oriental, the African, the Malayan, and various other people from all parts of the earth are to be equally accepted for immigration into this country and for admission to citizenship.

All I am calling attention to is that many people in my State of Florida do not agree with that principle, and they have objected to it.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall yield in a moment. It appears from the Record that

that is the principle upon which the pending bill is based.

The attitude of opposition to the pending bill by several thousand people in Florida who have written to me is rather fully justified now by the answers which have been put in the Record. I am grateful to my distinguished friends for making clear exactly what the bill means, exactly what Senators are asked to vote for, exactly how we are going to open the gates to all the people, disregarding the fact that our background is largely European and that we have gone so very far in the development of ourselves and of our resources, in giving gifts to others, and in helping all the races of the earth, whereas many of the other people have not been able to show anything comparable to that.

A nation that does not give some attention to the protection of its own rights, to the protection of its own citizenship, is a very unwise nation.

I have heard it said on the floor by one of my friends that some nations will be angry at us if we do not take the actions proposed in the pending bill. I do not believe that is true. I do not believe the nations of the earth are angry at Australia because of its restrictive immigration laws. Australia insists not only on selected nations, but also on selected individual capacities.

Australia is to be admired for its protection as it moves forward to greater status.

We shall regret it if we take this step, which is different from anything we have ever done before.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I believe we misunderstand the concept of what we are trying to do. Is the Senator from Florida saying that if Nigeria tomorrow were able to produce a scientist who could find a way that would make it possible for us to get to the moon before the Russians did, he should be excluded because he was black? Would the Senator do that, because he was black?

Mr. HOLLAND. Certainly not.

Mr. PASTORE. Well, that is what the pending bill in effect would be doing. The bill is saying, in effect, that it does not make any difference where one comes from, that it does not make any difference what the color of one's skin might be, if he can add to the glory of America he will be welcome to come into this country. That is what we are trying to do here, but the Senator is saying that many people in Florida object to anyone coming in if he is black, no matter how smart, no matter what his contribution can be, that because he is black he cannot come in.

I ask the Senator, is that what we understand to be Americanism?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, who has the floor?

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Florida has it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Russell of South Carolina in the chair). The Senator from Florida has the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the chair. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island that I do not have to be reminded what Americanism is. I have fought on foreign soil, and in foreign skies for this Nation. I know what it is to be shot down in combat. I wonder whether my distinguished friend from Rhode Island has had any such experience?

Mr. PASTORE. I know that. I appreciate that. I applaud it. But the Senator from Florida has made the point that we have to look to the mother country because Negroes cannot look back to their tribes, or wherever they came from, because, of course, their ancestors came to America as slaves. The Senator is making the point that it is not good for the development of America, that if we allow Negroes to come into this country, as Negroes, under the standards of the pending bill, it would mean that they would have to prove that they can make a contribution to America. But because he is black, many people in Florida do not like the idea. That is the substance of the argument being made in the Chamber at this moment by the Senator from Florida. I cannot accept that as a good American argument.

Mr. HOLLAND. In the first place, my enthusiastic friend from Rhode Island is no judge as to what a good American argument is. In the second place, let me say that my position is in no sense against the admission of anyone from anywhere. My objection is to taking a position under which we open our doors equally wide to all the people on the face of the earth, when we know perfectly well where the roots of our own background lie, where our own traditions came from, here our own inspiration comes from, and where our progress is based. We know perfectly well where we can gain people who will add instead of subtract from our opportunity to move forward.

So far as the admission of individuals of great skill is concerned, we found no difficulty at all with that at any time. The provisions of the present law, for that matter, have permitted just that kind of operation. I certainly would wish to have that kind of operation permitted in the future.

What I object to is imposing no limitations, insofar as areas of the earth are concerned, but saying that we are throwing the doors open and equally inviting people from the Orient, from the islands of the Pacific, from the subcontinent of Asia, from the Near East, from all of Africa, all of Europe, and all of the Western Hemisphere, on exactly the same basis. I am inviting attention to the fact that this is a complete and radical departure from what has always heretofore been regarded as sound principles of immigration.

That is the only point to which I invite attention. I am thoroughly within my rights in doing so. The people of my State are very much concerned about this matter. My mail also indicates that not only my people but a great many people from many other States are deeply concerned about it.

I might say to my distinguished friend from Rhode Island, who has talked about

Americanism, that highly patriotic bodies such as veterans' groups have gone on record as being decidedly against this radical change in our system of immigration. I invite attention to that. I have no objection to any Senator voting his convictions, and I hope that every Senator will vote his convictions—whatever they may be.

I hope the Senators will be representing their constituents when they vote on the bill. I shall be trying to do just that. I believe that is what the fundamental objective and requirement of representative government should be.

I am trying to say clearly, so that there can be no question about it, that by the questions raised by many people in Florida, I could not vote for this radical departure in our immigration policy—and I shall not do so.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Florida as he speaks for his constituents and their views on liberalizing our immigration policies. It is for that reason that I feel compelled to speak out for some of my constituents in Wyoming, namely, the more than 4,000 American Indians that live in my State. Through the eyes of the Indian, there is not a member of this body that is not an immigrant; and it ill behooves any of us immigrants to look down our noses at others who would seek but to do what our forefathers did—find a new opportunity in a new world.

Save for the voice of the Red Man in our country, no other voices raised against immigrants should be heeded or can speak with naught but ill grace.

My ancestors came from Western Europe. I believe that we should set a policy which will exemplify the kind of thing we should hold out to all the rest of the world.

Scientists have shrunk the world. Man's genius has so shriveled distance and time that we are, literally, sitting in each other's lap.

It is time that as Americans we realize that we have little right, in my judgment, to slam closed the door, once we ourselves get in the "club."

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Does the Senator from Florida remember, during the Second World War, what was the most highly decorated U.S. unit as a group?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have heard that the unit most decorated was the one in which the junior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inoué] served so well and so valiantly. It was, perhaps, the most highly decorated.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Is the Senator from Florida aware that the men who made up that unit could be described as orientals—that they were of Japanese origin?

Mr. HOLLAND. Certainly—I know that.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator from Florida is aware of the great contribution which they made to victory by the United States?

Mr. HOLLAND. I know that perfectly well. I have frequently expressed, publicly and privately, my great affection for the junior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE]. I was the first to sign a bill for statehood for Hawaii. I also had the honor to be invited to come out to Hawaii for its statehood celebration.

I am proud of Hawaii as our 50th State. I have no disposition at all to inveigh against anyone there. I merely state that when we open our doors wide to all the oriental nations of this earth, with some 700 to 800 million in 1 country alone, and with countless other millions in other nations, and when we offer to admit them on terms of exact equality with people from our own father nations, we are making a radical departure of which I cannot, and do not approve. That is the point.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator talks about opening the doors wide. The doors are open only to those who can make a contribution. The fact that someone came from Japan or China originally, the fact that someone comes from Italy, Poland, or Nigeria, makes no difference. They are all going to be considered equally as to whether they are going to be accepted into the United States. The person who comes from Japan can make quite as much of a contribution as anyone who comes from Europe, and I do not believe that he should be excluded merely because he is Japanese.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have considerable familiarity with that subject. Not only did I take the position I did with reference to Hawaii, but I had a classmate at the university who was a Chinese immigrant to this country in the old days. I saw him in later years, and was entertained by him when I went out to San Francisco. His chief claim to fame as an American was that he had been foreman of the jury which had convicted Harry Bridges in San Francisco.

The Senator from Florida has a great deal of appreciation for a great many of our people who have come from other places, but he does not want to see—and this is what it amounts to—this fruit basket turned over by having the whole world invited on the same basis to come to our land, which is the place where almost everyone else on earth wants to come, because the Senator from Florida can see the most dire consequences as a result of that policy. The Senator from Florida agrees with the expressions with respect to many people who are here. We have many people whose ancestors were Irish. We have many whose ancestors were Polish. We have many whose ancestors were Italian. We have many whose ancestors were Greek. We are proud and happy to have them. I believe this bill is a radical change in our whole immigration policy. It is unjustified, and I am only saying that I cannot vote for it.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, like the Senator from Florida, I entertain the opinion that the national origins quota system was a wise formula on which to base our immigration law. Instead of its being founded upon prejudice, it was based upon the assumption that we should welcome to this country for permanent residence and eventual citizenship immigrants with cultural backgrounds similar to those people already here, because such immigrants could be most readily assimilated into our population and into our life.

As Senator McCarran said, the national origins quota system held up a mirror to America and reflected America as we know it.

Mr. President, as a member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization and as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I have had to study this problem since February. In my study I found that the majority of the Members of the U.S. Congress do not entertain my conviction about the wisdom of the national origins quota system of the Walter-McCarran Act. So, as a member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization and a member of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, I was confronted by two possible courses of action. First, I could have spent my time and my energy in fighting a lost cause for the preservation of the national origins quota system, and I could have been faithful to an idea which I cherished. That was my first possible course of action.

My second possible course of action was to cooperate with the inevitable, which was the abolition of the national origins quota system by a majority of the Congress, and assist other Members of the Senate who happen to be members of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization to try to process the very best immigration bill we could for the United States under the circumstances, at a time when a majority of the Congress was going to abolish the national origins quota system, which I cherish, as does the Senator from Florida.

I believe I can truthfully say, as a member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization that, in my judgment, it has brought to the Senate a good immigration bill. The bill does not open the doors for the admission of all the people all over the face of the earth. It specifically restricts immigration to three groups of people. It extends the privilege of immigration to America to the relatives of American citizens already here, people who possess not only residence in America, but the right of citizenship in America, and it restricts those relatives to certain close relatives—not to cousins who may be all over the world, but to certain specified degrees of relationship.

That is the first group to which the bill grants the privilege of immigration to the United States.

The second group is composed of near relatives of persons who have already been received into the United States as permanent residents for the eventual

purpose of becoming citizens of the United States.

The third group the bill admits to the United States, from whatever country they may come, is immigrants who are able to contribute something to either the economic or cultural advancement of the United States because of their skills or because of their willingness to work in areas in which we have a short supply of labor in the United States.

The bill does abolish the national origins quota systems, which I personally would like to keep, because I think it is wise, for the reasons I have stated; but it does something to restrict immigration which has never been done before. It puts a limitation on all immigration we can receive from the Western Hemisphere, and by so doing extends to the Western Hemisphere the same policy which we have extended to the Eastern Hemisphere.

The bill does one thing which I personally would not have done if I had had a majority, and that is to abolish the national origins quota system of the Walter-McCarran Act. Nevertheless, I think the bill is a good bill which is designed to restrict our immigration while extending the privilege of immigration to all on the face of the earth. However, I emphasize that it is designed to restrict immigration to near relatives of those who are already in the United States either as citizens or as immigrants who have been admitted for permanent residents and eventual citizenship, and to those persons who have something to contribute to the economic and cultural development of the United States.

So I can say that notwithstanding the fact that I regret the bill does abolish, instead of retain, the national origins quota system, in my honest judgment it is a good measure. The bill should protect America and contribute substantially to the future development of our country.

I am sorry that my good friend from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] has left the Chamber. I started to say, in jesting guise, although it is not that—it is the truth, that I cannot take too much pride in the way our first immigrants acted in this country. A great historian said that the first thing the first immigrants did when they got to America was to fall on their knees, and the next thing was to fall on the aborigines. So for that reason I do not take any great pride as an American in the conduct of our early immigrants to this country in their relations with the Indians.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I hesitate to make the comment that I rise to make because my presence in the Senate may be an excellent argument for the point that perhaps the national origins quota system should have been in effect when my father came to this country. I believe it is undoubtedly true that if it had been in effect at that time his prospects for entering this country would have been substantially reduced to the point where he might not have entered it, I might not have been born here, might not have become Governor of my State, and might not have become a U.S. Senator.

So my entire life is testimony to my conviction that the philosophy of the bill before the Senate is the right one.

I do not believe that at any time in the first century of our national existence, or at any time prior to that, immigration into this country was in accordance with any fixed relationship of numbers as between peoples from different parts of the globe or from different countries. And so the base of our population was established without any such pigeon holes, without any such fixed guidelines.

I believe that what we should have learned from that experience is not that we had accidentally found the magic formula for the relationship between national backgrounds in this country, but rather that, without any magic formula, we have been able to bring into this country people from all over the globe, and that without exception our national experience demonstrates that each of them, whatever his origin, whatever the color of his skin, was able to make a positive contribution to the advancement of this country reflecting his individual merit.

So I am convinced, as I was when my father used to tell me of his own experience at his knee, that this country is a living, dynamic, growing illustration of the fact that all of God's children, when given the opportunities of freedom, can make freedom work, not only for their own advancement, but for the benefit of the society of which they are a part.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I heard with interest the remark of the Senator from North Carolina that the first settlers fell on their knees. That is true.

The first colonial settlers landed at Cape Henry in 1607 and fell on their knees to give thanks—a little before Plymouth. They gave thanks for their safe deliverance.

Later they erected a cross there, and we still have a cross there, where they gave thanks for their deliverance.

They did not fall on the aborigines. The aborigines fell on them. The aborigines murdered my ancestor there in 1622, and he had not bothered them at all.

The distinguished Senator made this bill better by his amendment. He says he will now cooperate with the inevitable.

I shall vote against the inevitable because I still believe in two principles. First, we were wise in adopting the original plan to have people of a like kind come in that could be absorbed. Second, insofar as concerns our 3 or 4 percent unemployed, I have no confidence whatever in the so-called screening process; that we will only get the cream and the skilled. The cream and the skilled stay at home. They have no reason to leave and are not coming to a new country. We will not get that type.

I regret to say that we will be in a minority, but I feel I am honored to represent a State where I believe the ma-

jority of the residents share my viewpoint.

Therefore, I am not misrepresenting the State when I say I shall vote against the bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, enacted under a very different political and moral climate from that which prevails today, was established on the false assumption of the superiority of northern Europeans over the other racial, cultural, and national categories of mankind. Though this doctrine is seldom overtly acknowledged by proponents of the present immigration statutes, this is the major rationale for the attempt to maintain the inequities in our current quota system. This quota system was neither wise nor equitable when it was established in 1952, and it is completely anachronistic in this year of 1965.

During the past 2 years, the American people and the American Congress have made a final and irrevocable commitment to the principle that equal opportunities shall not be denied a citizen of this country for reasons of race, color or national origin. The actions of this Congress and the actions of the prior 88th Congress repeatedly asserted that the talents and individual capabilities of a person are not determined or limited by his national or racial origins. The pending measure, H.R. 2580 extends this principle, and rightly so, to individuals of all races and nationalities in their opportunity to become American citizens.

Mr. President, it would be an evident contradiction for this Congress, which has enacted the most effective civil and voting rights legislation since the Reconstruction era, to maintain our present immigration quota system and thereby deny the validity of the basic principles we have previously enunciated.

The present quota system, which would within 3 years be eliminated by enactment of H.R. 2580, is not only unwise and inequitable; it is also shortsighted and self-defeating of the national interest. The only criteria which should be applied to immigrants to this country are those which are addressed to the capabilities and talents of the individual and not to the country of his origin. For only in this way will we be assured that new citizens of this country will bring potential enrichment to our society rather than mere uniformity with the present population balance.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, since its adoption in 1920, the national origins quota system has been a stain on the fabric of American democracy. I am proud to have cosponsored and worked for the adoption of this bill to abolish the national origins quota system for the allocation of immigrant visas.

The junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] has performed a distinguished service for our Nation in shepherding this bill through hearings and through the Judiciary Committee, and guiding it to the point of final passage.

In place of the discriminatory national origins system, this bill will substitute a new system based on prefer-

ences for close relatives of American citizens and resident aliens, for aliens who are members of the professions, or skilled in the arts or sciences, to workers whose skills are needed in our country and for certain categories of refugees.

Last year the Congress took a great step toward the elimination of racial discrimination against American citizens here at home. This year the Congress has passed legislation to do away with the last remaining obstacles to the attainment of the right to vote. This immigration reform bill is no less a civil rights measure. It will end four decades of intolerance toward those who seek shelter on our shores, and who, until they have actually sought entrance, have looked upon our Nation as a refuge and a haven from intolerance.

The present national origins quota system is completely inconsistent with the principle of equality of opportunity, upon which our Nation was founded, and with our historic tradition prior to 1920. It is sheer hypocrisy to extol the virtues of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, and at the same time to uphold an immigration system which is based on the principle of racial superiority.

Mr. President, when we began limiting immigration on the basis of race or national origin, we had forgotten that the very name "America" was given to our continent by a German mapmaker, Martin Waldseemüller, to honor an Italian explorer, Amerigo Vespucci. In his book, "A Nation of Immigrants," President Kennedy reminded us that the three ships that discovered America flew the Spanish flag, sailed under an Italian captain, and included as members of their crew an Irishman, a Negro, an Englishman, and a Jew.

I could list some of the many contributions which immigrants and the children of immigrants have made and are making to our society, but such a listing would be pointless. For it can truly be said that immigrants and their descendants, Americans all, are responsible for almost all that our Nation has accomplished. In every endeavor, from the world of music to the world of art, of statecraft, of scholarship, of commerce and industry, immigrants and their children have left their indelible mark on our Nation.

Mr. President, while this bill abolishes the discriminatory national origins quota system, and establishes a preference system to unite families and to expedite the admission of skilled, professional men into this country, it is not a radical measure. This bill includes strengthened safeguards to protect our economy from job competition and from adverse working standards as a consequence of immigrant workers entering the job market. An intended immigrant, under the provisions of the immigration reform bill, will have to obtain from the Secretary of Labor certification that his entrance will not adversely affect the American job market. There are no grounds for apprehension that this bill will disadvantage American workers.

The total authorized immigrants, under the most favorable conditions, will not exceed 355,000 per year, or less than two-tenths of 1 percent of our population. Thus this immigration reform bill will not permit more people to enter our country than our society and economy can absorb. However, instead of allocating quotas based on race, available spaces will be apportioned on the basis of individual worth, and the contribution which the individual can make.

My State of Maryland is a heterogeneous one, which has profited from the contributions of individuals of many races and nationalities. Indeed, Maryland was founded as a proprietary colony, under a grant to Cecilius Calvert, Lord Baltimore, to provide a haven, an area where people could settle, free from fear of religious persecution. Our Articles of Religious Toleration was the first such declaration adopted in this hemisphere.

But I do not support this bill solely because of Maryland's heritage of religious toleration. I do not support this bill solely on account of the great contributions which citizens of other than northern European descent have made to the development of my State. I support this bill because it is just, and fair, and American to judge a man by his skills, by his potential contribution, and not by irrelevant criteria such as race, or place of origin.

Let us adopt this immigration reform bill, so that our laws will conform to our needs, and our traditions, and our ideals.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I strongly support the immigration reform bill of 1965.

Our land is a land of opportunities. Today we in the Senate have a chance to extend these opportunities to those who can make the most valuable contributions to American life.

We can never have enough talent. And we will gain more talent when the immigration reform bill becomes law.

We can never have enough new ideas. And we will have many more when the immigration reform bill becomes law.

Our present immigration laws were enacted in 1924. They did not make sense then, and they make even less sense now in today's rapidly changing world. For the national origins quota system asks only when a man was born, not what he can do. If he is lucky, and happens to live in a country with a large quota, he may be able to emigrate to the United States. If he is unlucky, and happens to be from a country with a small quota, his chances are slimmer, no matter how badly he may want to come. This is true if he is from eastern or southern Europe, or from Asia. For the national origins quota discriminates against people from nations in these areas.

The national origins quota system does not make sense for another reason. In many countries stipulated quotas go unfilled. For example, the quota for British subjects is 65,000. Yet, only 25,000 British subjects emigrate to the United States each year. Elsewhere, people eagerly await an opportunity to come. In Italy, 265,000 people have registered for admission. But the quota is only

5,666. It is clear that the prospects for legal entry into the United States are small, indeed, for citizens of a country with such a small quota.

Mr. President, I am proud to be a co-sponsor of S. 500.

Our American tradition—our tradition of opportunity—demands that we change our immigration laws.

The requirements of a nation which is reaching for the Great Society compel us to change our immigration laws.

S. 500 will do this.

The bill gives preference to people with professional, scientific or artistic ability—who will enrich our national life.

It gives preference to families of immigrants who are already here—reuniting relatives separated long before.

This bill will finally reopen the gates of America for people who should be allowed to come to our shores. Let no one think we are displacing U.S. workers from their jobs. The Secretary of Labor must certify that an immigrant's presence here will have no effect on working conditions, wages or employment.

This bill must be passed. We can no longer afford to deprive our Nation of new talent and brains. Nor can we continue to show the world a prejudicial system of admissions to our shores that contradicts everything this Nation stands for.

We have a proud tradition. Let us show we practice what we preach by making our immigration procedure more American.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I support Senate passage of H.R. 2580, as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, although I wish to express my opposition to the provision which would modify the current nonquota status of nations of the Western Hemisphere and impose a quota of 120,000 annually, effective July 1, 1968.

I was pleased to be a sponsor of S. 500, the original proposal to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, which is similar in general to the bill being considered today.

This measure will provide a much needed and long overdue change in immigration policy. It is a limited measure, since it does not make any substantial increase in the number of immigrants who can enter each year. Its significance lies in its abolition of the quota based on national origins—a system which for the past 40 years has imposed a discriminatory procedure based on the assumed desirability or undesirability of certain ethnic and racial groups.

It is unfortunate that the national origins system was ever approved and unfortunate also that it was not removed sooner.

Times have changed and history has moved swiftly. We have in recent years, and again in this Congress, enacted significant legislation to safeguard civil and human rights and to protect the equality of all before the law. There have been Supreme Court decisions and executive orders to eliminate segregation and discrimination based on race. The bill now before the Senate is consistent with these

measures and restores to our immigration policy the fundamental principle that persons are to be judged as individuals and not on the basis of race or ethnic origin. In this respect H.R. 2580 is not a new departure; rather, it represents a return to the nondiscriminatory policy which existed at the beginning of our Nation. Many of the immigrants who came to the United States in the 19th century were impoverished and unskilled; others were religious or political refugees, outcasts from their homeland. They and their children proved themselves. Immigrants have demonstrated that opportunity and individual effort, rather than racial or ethnic origin, are the essential qualities of citizens.

The bill has many other provisions which are commendable. It removes the mechanical and rigid procedures which have operated to keep families separated. It reflects positively our concern for the importance of the family. The present laws have been unworkable as regards the problem of refugees, and the bill adjusts this situation. The mentally retarded and those who have suffered mental illness will be considered in a similar manner to those who are classified as tubercular, and the bill removes the total exclusion of those afflicted with epilepsy. In these and other provisions the bill reflects understanding and concern for the dignity of the individual person.

I believe that the committee amendment to place a ceiling on immigrants from nations of the Western Hemisphere is unnecessary and unwise. There is no pressing problem of numbers which requires this limitation and in any case the qualitative controls applying to all immigrants have set adequate limitations in the past. Of course, there is no reason in theory why we could not have worldwide or hemispheric quotas, but there are many reasons based on tradition why we should not impose a numerical quota by law on immigrant from the Western Hemisphere. Mexico and Canada are neighbors with whom we have thousands of miles of common border and there is no need to place their citizens who wish to emigrate to the United States under a general quota limitation. All the nations of the Western Hemisphere share with us the settlement of the New World and a common effort to develop free and independent governments. Our nonquota policy of the past was never intended and never interpreted as discriminatory against nations outside the Western Hemisphere; rather, it was and is a mark of mutual respect and friendship and a symbol of the good neighbor policy.

A HISTORIC STEP FORWARD FOR AMERICA

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, passage of this amendment to the Immigration and Naturalization Act will be a historic step in the progress of the United States toward a society of equal opportunity for all. Just as we have struggled to eliminate the barriers of poverty and race within our borders, now we are ending a system of arbitrary discrimination based on nationality and

Member of this body. The Senator was in constant attendance at the hearings before the subcommittee and the full committee. He brought a unique background and experience to the discussion.

The makeup of this committee was of such a nature that we would not have been able to get the bill out of the subcommittee unless we had the leadership of the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who rendered invaluable assistance in the crucial hours of the bill. He assisted when many of us were wondering whether this Congress was going to have an opportunity to act this year on a matter consistent with the other actions which have been taken in other legislation dealing with equality of opportunity. The equal right to the vote, equal opportunity for our young people in education, and a better opportunity for those who live in poverty, all these measures and the immigration bill stand out as the mark of a Congress concerned with the quality of American life.

Many of us felt that it was the responsibility of this Congress to speak out on this issue. At a critical time, the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois, brought forth an understanding and comprehension of the issue and rendered invaluable assistance in having the bill passed.

Mr. President, I am deeply indebted to all of these Senators and to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYRINGS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HAUSSKA], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], all of whom were interested in the legislation and participated in the work of the committee. They were in constant contact with me during the course of the debate. They were extremely helpful.

Mr. President, I should like to add one very important name that will always be associated with this bill. The deep concern and conviction of the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, is attested to by the fact that we have been able to act successfully here today. He was concerned with it, he has been interested in it, he has followed our progress closely, and I think that his interest and his concern in designating the legislation as one of his priority measures had a great deal to do with the action of the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. President, I could not let this opportunity pass without recognizing the occupant of the chair and without saying how much I recognize the contribution that the Vice President of the United States has made in bringing this legislation to the point at which this Congress and this Senate could pass the measure today.

I know that the Vice President of the United States was in the forefront of the battle in 1952. He has been interested in the problem and concerned with it. I know that he shares with all Senators

the joy experienced by virtue of the passage of the bill before the Senate today.

The passage of this bill is also to the credit of the Attorney General, Mr. Katzenbach, and the Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk. They, with their able assistants, such as Norbert Schlei, the Assistant Attorney General, and Abba Schwartz, Director of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, worked long and hard for this victory today. I would also commend Mr. James Hines, of State, and Mr. Robert Salaslon, of Justice, and Mr. Gene Krejuk, of the State Department.

Last, but not least, Mr. President, we are indebted to the staff members of the Senate Immigration Subcommittee, Mr. Fred Mesmer and Mr. Drury Blair.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Senator has spoken about everybody but himself. I think that it is very appropriate for someone on the minority side to speak of him.

He is a young man. However, this is the second time that he has shown his outstanding ability in handling a matter on the floor of the Senate.

I just discussed with the majority leader the very extraordinary point that a highly controversial bill went through to passage without it being necessary—and I emphasize that word—to vote on a single amendment.

That is a most extraordinary record.

I, too, should like to join in the tribute paid by the Senator from Massachusetts to the other Senators.

I should like especially to emphasize the triumph of the legislative mind and the ability of the rest of us to agree on important points with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] who indicated an objectivity and understanding of the legislative process which was most admirable.

Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from Massachusetts can write this event down as one of his finest hours, whatever Senators may think on the questions involved, or his views or mine, or the views on the other side.

The Record is very clear on that. The clearest thing in the Record is the vote. I am very proud of the Senate that, this afternoon, has taken, by such an enormous affirmative vote, an historic step forward in the foreign and humanitarian policy of the United States.

I think the Senator for the rest of his life will have every reason to look back at his role of Senator in charge of this bill with the greatest of gratification.

I join with the Senator from Massachusetts in thanking the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois, for his assistance in this matter. I am confident that, without him, we would not be where we are. We are all very grateful to him. The country is most grateful to the minority leader.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his most gracious remarks. If it had not been for the tact

and the understanding and the devotion which the Senator from Massachusetts gave to this bill, the bill would never have come from the subcommittee or the full committee in such fine form.

I am also deeply grateful to the senior Senator from New York, not only for his gracious remarks, but also for his contributions to the bill.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I, too, join in expressing praise and thanks to the junior Senator from Massachusetts for his magnificent performance.

Two Presidents of the United States have played a historic role in the passage of this legislation. I believe that we should nail that fact in the Record. John Kennedy had no higher priority than the achievement of the elimination of the national origins quota system. He must be very proud to see the Senate, and more particularly, the Senator in charge of the bill, at this moment.

I doubt very much if this hour would have arrived except for Lyndon Johnson.

Some day some Ph. D. may write a thesis on how it is that a man from Texas put together all the forces and brought to bear the conscience of a country on an issue which really has very little significance constitutionally, but is on a very high moral plane. I know that any historian will seek to find the answer as to him more than anyone else.

I suggest that it may very well prove to be the combination of the two Presidents who were responsible for this moment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it was most gracious of the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] to say what he has just said about the President of the United States.

It is obvious to all, I believe, that both our late, beloved President, John F. Kennedy, and the present Chief Executive of this Nation, Lyndon B. Johnson deserve an accolade for their efforts in this field. It is in no small measure due to the efforts of both of these Presidents that we have arrived today at the historic point of passage of an immigration reform bill which abolishes the national origins quota system. I join now with those who give deserved credit to President Johnson and our late President Kennedy.

Mr. President, a cherished hope of many Members of this body, as well as many of the people of this great Nation, was realized today in the Senate's strong affirmative vote abolishing the national origins quota system in our immigration laws. This is, indeed, an historic occasion marking the culmination of the efforts of many, including all of our recent Presidents.

The national origins quota system was inequitable. But the mere abolition of that system was not enough; a workable and just substitute had to be found. Mr. President, in this bill, through the unselfish efforts of many, such a substitute is embodied. The new system of allocation is based on a system of preferences extending equal opportunity to all nationalities, demonstrating the humanity of this great nation and its continuing dedication to freedom, and yet—

and this is of prime importance—fulfilling the needs of our own country. Priority in the issuance of immigrant visas is given to close relatives of U.S. citizens and aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence, to aliens who are members of the professions, arts or sciences, to skilled or unskilled laborers who are actually needed in the United States, and to refugees fleeing religious or political persecution or seeking refuge from the chaos of natural disasters.

Mr. President, not enough can be said in support of these goals. I will, however, conclude these brief comments on the substance of this bill by saying that through it America will continue to be a beacon to the world. It will continue to merit the praise of the German farmer who, as quoted in the late President Kennedy's perceptive book, "A Nation of Immigrants," wrote from his new home in Missouri in 1834:

If you wish to see our whole family living in * * * a country where freedom of speech obtains, where no spies are eavesdropping, where no simpletons criticize your every word and seek to detect therein a venom that might endanger the life of the state, the church, and the home, in short, if you wish to be really happy and independent, then come here.

It is especially appropriate, in view of the very particular interest of the late beloved President Kennedy in reform of our immigration laws, that this measure should be managed by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. But as the Senator from Massachusetts has more than amply demonstrated, there were also excellent reasons on the merits why that assignment was so made. Senator KENNEDY has proven himself to be one of the most well prepared and skilled of floor managers. He is, indeed, a veteran of the Senate who has come through with flying colors under the responsibility of managing a very important and very complex piece of legislation.

A little earlier this afternoon, during discussion of this bill, we were treated to another of the sensitive, eloquent speeches of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the very distinguished and cooperative minority leader. The minority leader played no small part in the passage of this bill and I thank him, as always, for the part he has played.

Both the junior Senator from Massachusetts and the junior Senator from Illinois are members of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Committee on the Judiciary, which worked for many, many days to put this very important measure in shape and present it to the Senate. During those long, hard efforts and even for many years in the past, the proponents of this bill included in the forefront the other members of that subcommittee, from both sides of this aisle. Of special significance were the efforts of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], who earlier this year sponsored, together with 33 other Senators, the bill which served as the blueprint for the Senate's work on the measure passed today, and the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] who has gained preeminence among the leaders in this country who have with

perseverance and patience sought an end to the national origins quota system. I am proud that we have crowned their efforts with success today.

The subcommittee and the committee could not have succeeded without the undaunted effort and unselfish cooperation of the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] and the senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG]. The Senator from North Carolina devoted his unmatched legal skills to hammering out the provisions of this bill, and the Senator from Hawaii brought to the bill the in-depth analysis of a true scholar as well as the special sensitivity required for adequate treatment of this most significant immigration bill.

Others lent their special skills and devoted their sharp analysis as well as eloquent remarks to this measure. Many of these have time and again over the years spoken out forcefully in favor of the goals of this legislation. I commend them all. I especially want to congratulate the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSEL], the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE and Mr. PELL], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], and the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

This bill has been, Mr. President, a model of deliberative treatment by the Senate. It is, without question, one of the most important measures treated by the Senate in this most productive Congress. It restates this country's devotion to equality and freedom. I am happy to be a part of the Senate which has taken affirmative action on this truly historic legislative measure.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, as a member of the Judiciary Committee, which has worked on this bill, I join my colleagues in highly commending the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] for his dedicated effort in seeing the bill through. He has worked very hard on the bill. He has sat through many meetings and listened to a large number of witnesses with great patience. He has brought considerable knowledge to bear upon this extremely complex legislation, and it is through his dedication and very excellent leadership that the Senate has at long last passed the bill.

No doubt great credit should be given our great late President, John F. Kennedy, and our present President Johnson, for their support of the bill. But it was primarily through the untiring efforts of the junior Senator from Massachusetts that the bill has finally been brought to the floor and passed.

As a descendant of those people who came from the Far East, and as one who has felt the sting of the discriminatory features of present immigration laws, I want to say that this is a great day for the Senate of the United States. This is a bright moment in history in which so many of the Senators agreed, by their 76 affirmative votes, that this bill is just, fair, and equitable. Again I should like to commend the junior Senator from Massachusetts for his indefatigable managing of this very meritorious bill, which is far-reaching in its purview and which will stand as a beacon light to the hu-

manitarianism, to the fair play, and to the greatness of this Nation. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has done a magnificent job. He should be very proud that he has played such a critically important part in bringing the measure to fruition.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I congratulate the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] on his skill, tact, and tenacity in managing this exceedingly complicated and far-reaching immigration bill.

It is an excellent bill and one that combines our basic ideas of man's equality to man and the needs of compassion with the realities of our political process and of our national interest.

Senator KENNEDY, in managing and fighting for this bill and its principles in the Senate, has shown an awareness of all these qualities—man's equality, compassion, our political process and national interest.

The senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] is to be congratulated on his sense of fair play and justice in helping this bill along to final passage. I thank him, too, for his role in the writing of this legislation.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 4. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of sewage treatment works, to require establishment of water quality criteria, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1221. An act for the relief of Betty H. Going;

H.R. 2414. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain lands situated in the State of Oregon to the city of Roseburg, Ore.;

H.R. 4152. An act to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933 to provide means for expediting the retirement of Government capital in the Federal intermediate credit banks, including an increase in the debt permitted such banks in relation to their capital and provision for the production credit associations to acquire additional capital stock therein, to provide for allocating certain earnings of such banks and associations to their users, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4603. An act for the relief of Lt. (jg.) Harold Edward Henning, U.S. Navy;

H.R. 7090. An act for the relief of certain individuals;

H.R. 8715. An act to authorize a contribution by the United States to the International Committee of the Red Cross;

H.R. 9877. An act to amend the act of January 30, 1913, as amended, to remove certain restrictions on the American hospital of Paris;

H.R. 10323. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 98. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to extend

becomes legally incompetent and loses his rights when he is committed to a hospital for treatment."

Attorneys should also be made aware of the Senator's cosponsorship of a bill to authorize all attorneys, licensed in their home State, to practice before administrative agencies without separate admission by the agency involved.

Neither the last nor the least of his zealous pursuit of the means to safeguard individual liberties is his current inquiry into Federal employees rights in firings, hirings, and personnel practices.

Of this dedicated lawyer, jurist, legislator, and patriot it can truly be said he is an example of the fulfillment of the late President Kennedy's admonition to us all, "Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what can you do for your country."

THE RECENT CIVIL DISTURBANCES IN LOS ANGELES

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, much has been written and said about the recent violent disturbances in Los Angeles, but I think nowhere have such unfortunate occurrences been put in better perspective than they were in a statement of Prince Hall Grand Masters, made in San Francisco, Calif., in August 1965.

Amos T. Hall, a good friend and a good man, has relayed this statement to me.

Believing that it will be of interest to all Senators, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF PRINCE HALL GRAND MASTERS, AUGUST 1965, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Prince Hall Masonry with a membership of approximately one-half million, reaffirms its historical position of protest in seeking to eliminate the inequities of citizenship and every form of discrimination from the American scene.

We deplore the recent violent disturbances which have resulted in the loss of lives and the destruction of millions of dollars worth of property in cities of the United States without regard to sectional location.

We direct attention to the courageous leadership of President Johnson, which has resulted in the enactment of advanced civil rights legislation by the Congress of the United States and to his expressions and proclamations regarding the public acceptance of the fact that all citizens of our Nation are entitled to, and should have, equal protection and application of the law, irrespective of their race, color, or religious affiliations.

We call upon every Prince Hall Mason as a leader in his community to use his influence to keep this protest nonviolent as he strives to eliminate injustice and discrimination. We urge that violence be avoided and solutions sought within the framework of the Constitution and laws of the United States.

AQUILA QUARRY REVISITED

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of the attached editorial from the Richmond News Leader of September 21, 1965, entitled "Aquila Quarry Revisited."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Richmond News Leader, Sept. 21, 1965]

AQUILA QUARRY REVISITED

Last week we reported on the strange tactics of those who were asserting that George Washington, the Father of his Country, was a common crooked politician. The story was that he had finessed a little deal to gyp the Federal Government by selling second-rate Aquila stone for building the U.S. Capitol. But ever-alert researchers up at Mount Vernon had quickly shown from letters that Washington never owned the quarry at Aquila Creek; and that in fact the Federal Government bought the quarry outright from other owners and cut the stone itself.

Today the mail brings to hand a year-old issue of Lawyers Title News, giving a complete history of the ownership of the Aquila quarry—and its confused tangle of titles. The article backs up the Mount Vernon research with the expert legal scholarship of an associate counsel for Lawyers Title Insurance Co., Marvin C. Bowling, Jr. It's clear from Mr. Bowling's study that Washington had nothing to do with the quarry.

Lawyers Title got into the problem a couple of years ago, when after a routine search, it insured a seemingly perfect title to the island where the quarry is located. The abstract showed an unbroken title running back to the Commonwealth of Virginia in 1877. At that time, the State had granted the island to two individuals on a land office warrant. The overgrown quarry which provided stone for the U.S. Capitol and the White House was forgotten and undetected. Then one day the new, 20th century owner discovered signs on the island warning: "U.S. Government property—keep off." Soon an official advertisement appeared indicating that the land would be sold by the General Services Administration at public auction.

The supposed owner grew alarmed. Lawyers Title was appalled. After running down a number of U.S. Government agencies that handle property, Mr. Bowling finally found the right one. Yes, they had a title, officials explained; it went straight back to Charles II, and the U.S. Government had the paper to prove it.

In 1678, the island was granted by the "Governor and Captain General of Virginia" to two individuals who had performed services for the King. The next instrument, dated 1694, stated that the first grant was void; the new instrument transferred the land to a George Brent. And the grantors were the successors to the original proprietors, the successors being Margaret Lady Culpeper, Thomas Lord Fairfax, Catherine, his wife, and Alexander Culpeper, Esq. Thus the interest in the property went back all the way to the original grant of the entire Northern Neck to the Culpepers in 1669. For upon the death of Lord Culpeper, his interest became vested in his daughter Catherine, wife of Lord Fairfax. The family then sold to Brent.

The property remained in the Brent family, famous Catholic recusants from Maryland, for 97 years. In 1791, another George Brent conveyed the island to Peter Charles L'Enfant—the man who laid out the terrifying complexity of Washington streets—for 1,800 pounds. The title was confirmed in the name of the trustees for the commissioners appointed to establish a "seat of government of the United States." The stone was cut, the Capitol built, the quarry abandoned, and the very ownership of the island forgotten. Many records in the Stafford County courthouse were destroyed by Union soldiers. And in 1877, the State of Virginia, blissfully unaware that it possessed no right to the land, granted it anew.

Through the peculiar precedence of royal and Federal sovereignty, Lawyers Title's client lost the land, and was left with the proceeds of the title insurance. Eventually the GSA disposed of the historical plot of

land as surplus. Despite the complexity of the ownership of the quarry, it is evident that George Washington's detractors have no title to their false claim.

PLIGHT OF THE JEWS IN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on Sunday, September 19, American Jews assembled in Lafayette Park across from the White House to call world attention to the plight of the Jews of the Soviet Union.

The Jews of that country are subjected to discrimination. Like other peoples in the Soviet Union, they are regarded as a nationality group. They are named as Jews on their passports. But they are not permitted the rights accorded to other nationalities. Their schools, their theater, their culture, their books, their learning, their newspapers—all these have disappeared. For almost half a century, ever since the Soviet revolution of 1917, this great community, which was once a reservoir of learning for world Jewry, has been cut away and isolated from Jews of other lands, from its own historic pact. Gradually, but inexorably, it will be cut away from its identity and it will cease to exist.

Officials of our own country are aware of this injustice and have joined with the American Jewish community in appeals to the Soviet Union for a rectification of this wrong. Our own body has spoken twice on this subject during the last 2 years and, during the last few months, President Lyndon B. Johnson has twice expressed his own views publicly.

Last Sunday, on September 19, as Jews began a vigil in Lafayette Park to attest their concern and to protest against the gradual disappearance of the Jewish people of the Soviet Union, the President addressed a message to that demonstration, and I ask unanimous consent that the President's message be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 17, 1965.

I greet my fellow Americans of all faiths gathered today in a vigil for Soviet Jewry. Your cause is the cause of all men who value freedom.

History demonstrates that the treatment of minorities is a barometer by which to measure the moral health of a society. Just as the condition of the American Jew is a living symbol of American achievement and promise, so the conditions of Jewish life and other religious minorities in the Soviet Union reveal fundamental contradictions between the stated principles and the actual practices of the Soviet system.

I once again express my hope for an end to the restrictive practices which prevent Soviet Jews from the full enjoyment of their heritage. Join all men everywhere who through vigilance maintain freedom's eternal light.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed; and the Chair lays

before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I submit for the Record, a statement prepared by the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower], and ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR TOWER

There can be little doubt that the pending immigration bill is not nearly so objectionable as it was when it was first introduced as an administration measure at the beginning of the year. However, I remain opposed to its enactment because I do not believe that in the long run it will promote the general welfare of the United States. On the contrary, I am of the opinion that if we enact this proposed legislation, we will be adding unnecessary weight to the burdens that will have to be borne by future generations of Americans.

A number of basic changes were made in the bill before it was passed by the House of Representatives. These changes, along with other additional amendments made by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, have made it an entirely different measure from the one that was recommended in the President's January 13 message to Congress. The bill's provisions regarding basic changes in the quota system were drastically altered. The provisions for a Presidential commission, which would eventually have been responsible for formulating immigration policy, I am glad to say, have been deleted. Stronger controls against immigration that would displace American workers from their jobs and adversely affect wages and working conditions in this country have been incorporated into the bill. These are noteworthy improvements, but they do not, in my opinion, justify the bill's enactment.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR TOWER

Under the provisions of this bill, the volume of immigration into this country would be bound to significantly increase. The estimates that have been made concerning the size of this increase vary from 60,000 to 100,000 or more. Considering that an average of 300,000 immigrants have been admitted annually in recent years, this means that we will have upwards of 400,000 immigrants a year under the bill.

I do not believe that it is wise for us to be increasing immigration at the present time. Notwithstanding its provisions, which are supposed to safeguard domestic workers, this bill will increase the size of our labor force, both immediately and even more markedly in the years ahead when the younger immigrants and the offspring of those admitted reach working age.

Moreover, I am not at all assured that the intended safeguards of workers in this country will prove effective with respect to the immigrant to whom they are intended to apply. Frankly, I see nothing but a tremendous bureaucratic nightmare in attempting to put these provisions into effect. Under the bill, a job clearance would be required for each individual applicant for an immigration visa, stating that the applicant will not displace a qualified American worker or have any adverse effect on wages and working conditions of domestic workers. The job clearance would be required for every immigrant except those granted preference under the bill by reason of their relationship to a

U.S. citizen or an alien admitted for permanent residence.

The enactment of these provisions would, in my opinion, cast an impossible burden upon the Labor Department if it is to administer them effectively. Imagine, if we will, the involved decisions that would have to be made in applying these restrictions to thousands upon thousands of prospective immigrants each year. In my opinion, the provisions are utterly unworkable and give every indication of being inserted in the bill merely to provide an answer to those who would raise questions concerning the bill's effects on our labor market.

Each generation of Americans has a responsibility to those that will follow after it. That responsibility is now ours, to leave our children and their children a country in which to live which will be free of any difficulties or problems of our making that we ourselves would not want to face.

I firmly believe that if we enact this proposed legislation increasing immigration, we will be abdicating this responsibility for the shortsighted and transient goals of political expediency. Many of the social and economic problems we face today may well be inconsequential in comparison to those of future generations with our vastly expanding populations.

Certainly, it is impossible to say at what precise point a country becomes overpopulated. This does not mean, however, that we cannot clearly recognize when we are faced with population problems. I believe we are facing them now. We have reached a point when our water resources are being taxed severely in order to meet present needs in many parts of the country, for example. Many of our rivers and streams have become polluted to the degree that they no longer afford the recreational facilities, or meet the needs for modest and industrial water consumption that they did just a few years ago. One of the Great Lakes, we are told, is now in the process of dying from such pollution. New York and other cities in New England and Middle Atlantic States are now experiencing the serious problems that arise from lack of clean, fresh water. Water problems are numerous in my area of the country. In the face of such problems like these, and others, I feel that we must move most cautiously in considering legislation which would add stimulus to the pace of our population growth.

There are several provisions of the bill which I would support, but not at the expense of increasing the volume of immigration, which would be the major effect of its enactment. I strongly support, for example, the abolishment of the Asia-Pacific triangle which has been especially discriminatory. I also lend my support to the committee amendment to the bill providing a numerical limitation on Western Hemisphere immigration. I do not view this amendment as an affront to our Western Hemisphere neighbors. I doubt that in their mature judgment they would view it as such either. The family reunification and skill requirement provisions of the bill are most meritorious.

It is evident that the national origins quota system has in some ways been discriminatory, and that it has not always worked as it was intended to. These claims, of course, have some merit, but that does not justify enactment, in my opinion, of legislation to greatly increase the numbers of immigrants that will be admitted into the country. Certainly, it is possible to reform the basic law without increasing immigration. That is what I would prefer to do.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, just 4 years ago today on September 22, 1961, President John F. Kennedy approved Public Law 87-293, the Peace Corps Act. This historic measure, which was enacted with overwhelming Democratic and Republican support in both Houses of Congress, has continued to justify the hopes and the dreams of those who gave it their faith.

Peace Corps volunteers are now located in 46 countries. At the end of the 1964 program year the Peace Corps had 10,494 volunteers and trainees in service. At the end of the August 31, 1965, program year, the Peace Corps had 12,000 volunteers and trainees in service. Legislation recently approved by Congress will authorize 15,110 volunteers and trainees by August 31, 1966. An overwhelming number of these trainees are devoting themselves to education. Others are helping in community action, agriculture, and health among others.

The example they have set by personal conduct has truly demonstrated that Americans are a helpful and compassionate people. The spirit of 1776 as exemplified in the Declaration of Independence called upon our people "to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of Nature and of Nature's God entitled them." That declaration held the following truths to be self-evident that:

All men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Peace Corps volunteers have sought to bring this hope of 1776 to the developing nations of 1965. And they are succeeding. In Afghanistan when the Peace Corps first went to help the people there they were limited to 15 volunteers—9 actually went—located only in the capital city of Kabul. We now have 190 Peace Corps volunteers there serving in many parts of that land. In Colombia Peace Corps volunteers are producing educational television programs which are bringing the benefits of education and culture to many people of that land.

The projects are innumerable and worthwhile, but it is the spirit and representations which these Americans, men and women, young and old, make for a free way of life that is most meaningful. They do not live in Embassy compounds. They do not shop at the PX. They live with the people. They eat their food. They share their life as they work to understand and help them help themselves.

When the Peace Corps started with the verve and enthusiasm which it combined, many Washington cynics thought that it would not be long before the Peace